THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

617063

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

AUTHORISED EDITION.

FOURTH SERIES,

Commencing with the Third Session of the Twenty-sixth Parliament

of the

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

---

60 VICTORIÆ.

VOLUME XLIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE SEVENTH DAY OF MAY

TO

THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF MAY

1897.

WATERLOW & SONS LIMITED,
Contractors to Her Majesty's Government,
25, 26, & 27, GREAT WINCHESTER STREET, E.C.;
BLOMFIELD HOUSE, LONDON WALL, E.C.;
FINSBURY STATIONERY WORKS, CLIFTON STREET, E.C.
49, PARLIAMENT STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.;
TEMPLE ROW, BIRMINGHAM.

PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS OF
"THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES," AUTHORISED EDITION
(UNDER CONTRACT WITH H. M. GOVERNMENT).

89127

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_may-07-may-31-1897_49

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME XLIX.

FOURTH SERIES.

LORDS, FRIDAY, 7TH MAY 1897.

Page

Trusts (Scotland) Bill :—Considered in Committee; reported without amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.] :—Report of Amendments put off 1

Archdeaconry of Cornwall Bill :—Read 2^a, and committed 1

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE :—Question, Earl of Morley; Answers, Earl of Pembroke and Earl of Ancaster 1

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 7TH MAY 1897.

QUESTIONS.

MODEL SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 3

EVICTION (CO. LONGFORD)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 3

LONGFORD CANAL HARBOUR—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 4

SCOTS GREYS—Questions, Mr. Hozier; Answers, Under Secretary of State for War 5

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Vice President of the Council 5

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Vice President of the Council 6

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Questions, Mr. J. Stuart and Sir H. Fowler; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 6

WATER SUPPLY (URSWICK)—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, Secretary to the Local Government Board 8

[*May* 7.] Page

TRANSVAAL (JAMESON RAID)—Question, Mr. T. Bayley ; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 8
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Maclure, Mr. H. Foster, and Captain Phillpotts ; Answers, Chancellor of the Exchequer, First Commissioner of Works, and First Lord of the Admiralty 9
STRABANE EQUITY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. Macaleese ; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 10
CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Baillie ; Answer, Lord Advocate 10
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND)—Question, Sir C. Cameron ; Answer, Vice President of the Council 11
WATERFORD, DUNGARVAN, AND LISMORE RAILWAY COMPANY—Questions, Mr. Power ; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 11
GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF IRELAND—Question, Mr. Daly ; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 12
LAND COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Daly and Mr. P. M'Hugh ; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland... 12
WRECK (S.S. "MEMPHIS")—Question, Sir G. Baden-Powell ; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 13
NAVY (PULMONARY DISEASES)—Question, Captain Phillpotts ; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 13
METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS BILL—Questions, Mr. Pickersgill ; Answers, Under Secretary for the Home Department, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Home Secretary 14
TREASON-FELONY PRISONERS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. MacNeill ; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 15
FALKLAND ISLANDS—Question, Mr. MacNeill ; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 16
TRANSVAAL (IMMIGRATION LAW)—Question, Mr. Buxton ; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 17
POOR LAW RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. J. P. Farrell ; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 17
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (MORNING SITTINGS)—Question, Captain Bethell ; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 17
MINING ACCIDENT (DURHAM)—Question, Mr. Fenwick ; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 18

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY :—Considered in Committee.—[SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY]—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.—

Class II.—CRETE :—£49,705, to complete the sum for the Foreign Office 18
Amendment proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £500, in respect of the salary of the Secretary of State."—*(Mr. Robson)* ... 18
The Committee divided :—Ayes, 63 ; Noes, 169.—(Division List, No. 192.) Original question again proposed. Motion withdrawn ... 63
1. £8,485, to complete the sum for the House of Lords... 63
Amendment proposed, to reduce the Vote by £6,000—*(Mr. Dillon)* 68

Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,485, be granted for the said Service."—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 50 ; Noes, 153.—(Division List, No. 193).—Original Question put :—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 162 ; Noes, 39.—(Division List, No. 194) ... 78

2. £7,074, to complete the sum for the Privy Council 78

Amendment proposed, "That Item A (Salaries be reduced by £700, in respect of the salary of the Clerk of the Council"—*(Mr. Gibson Bowles)* 79

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 46 ; Noes, 167.—(Division List, No. 195) 81

Amendment proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £1,142, in respect of the salary of the Deputy Clerk of the Council and the Chief Clerk."—*(Mr. MacNeill)* 81

Mr. Hanbury claimed to move, "That the Question be now put" ... 83

Question put, "That the Question be now put."—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 163 ; Noes, 49.—(Division List, No. 196) ... 83

Question put accordingly.—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 43 ; Noes, 168.—(Division List, No. 197) 83

Mr. Hanbury claimed to move, "That the original Question be now put."—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 168 ; Noes, 39.—(Division List, No. 198.)—Progress reported 83

WAYS AND MEANS : Committee deferred 83

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill :—Second Reading deferred... ... 83

Church Patronage Transfer Bill : —Second Reading deferred 84

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 84

Canals Protection (London) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 84

Mersey Channels Bill :—Third Reading deferred 84

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 84

Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 84

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 84

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred... 84

LORDS : MONDAY, 10TH MAY 1897.

GREECE AND THE POWERS :—

Earl of Kimberley ... 85 *Prime Minister* 85

Juries' Detention Bill :—Motion made, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—*(Lord Coleridge)* 86

Lord Chief Justice ... 86 *Lord Herschell* 88
Lord Chancellor... ... 87

Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 88

[*May* 10.] *Page*

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment Bill:—Read 2a, and Committed to a Committee of the Whole House 89

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.]:—Amendments reported 89

Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation Bill:—Second Reading put off ... 89

Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage) Bill:—Second Reading put off 89

COMMONS: MONDAY, 10TH MAY 1897.

PRIME MINISTER (DUAL OFFICES):—Notice of Motion—*(Mr. MacNeill)* ... 89

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLY (RIVER NETHY)—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, Lord Advocate 90

PENSIONS COMMUTATION BOARD—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 90

POSTAL FACILITIES (ISLAND OF LEWIS)—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 91

GAMBLING IN FUTURES AND OPTIONS—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 92

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT—Question, Mr. Ashton; Answer, Vice President of the Council 92

EDUCATION (HALF-TIME SCHOLARS)—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 92

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Carew and Mr. Clancy; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 93

TUSKAR LIGHT (TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION)—Question, Mr. Drage; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 93

CYCLING IN HYDE PARK—Question, Sir H. Vincent; Answer, First Commissioner of Works... 94

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Boulnois and Mr. Hogan; Answers, First Commissioner of Works and Home Secretary 94

PARIS FIRE (SAFETY OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS)—Questions, Mr. Aird and Mr. Fardell; Answers, Home Secretary 95

LINKED BATTALION SYSTEM—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for War 96

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. Daly and Mr. Macaleese; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 97

POST OFFICE (FEMALE CLERKS)—Question, Mr. McKenna; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 98

GRANARD (POLICE ARRANGEMENTS)—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 98

RED SEA (LIGHTING)—Question, Sir Edward Hill; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 99

ARD WEST PIER (CARNA, CONNEMARA)—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 99

POSTAL DELIVERY (CARNA)—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury... 100

[*May* 10.] *Page*

TURCO-GREEK WAR—Question, General McCalmont; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 100
ARMY REGULATIONS (ST. PATRICK'S DAY)—Questions, Mr. MacNeill and Captain Donelan; Answers, Under Secretary for War [Mr. Speaker]... 100
RAIATEA (DISTURBANCES)—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 103
ARMY HORSES—Questions, Mr. Hogan and Captain Donelan; Answers, Under Secretary for War 104
POST OFFICE ANNUITIES—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 104
ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY—Questions, Mr. MacNeill; Answers, Vice President of the Council 105
CANALS AND NAVIGABLE RIVERS (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 106
PRISON SYSTEM (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, Lord Advocate 106
WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Home Secretary 107
TELEGRAPH OFFICES (PUBLIC GUARANTEE)—Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 107
LOAN FUND SOCIETIES (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. J. P. Farrell, and Mr. R. M. Dane; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 107
MARYBOROUGH PRISON (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 109
BROOKEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 109
ARTILLERY PRACTICE (SOLENT)—Question, Sir G. Baden-Powell; Answer, Under Secretary for War 110
RADHANPUR (STATE PROPERTY)—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Secretary of State for India 110
EXCISE PROSECUTION (MARYLEBONE)—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 111
QUEENSLAND—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 112
ROMFORD RAILWAY STATION (FATAL ACCIDENT)—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair; Answer, President of the Board of Trade... 113
COLLECTION OF RATES (DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 113
LABOURERS' COTTAGES (CO. MEATH)—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 114
BLACKROCK TOWNSHIP COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 114
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. Gedge, Mr. Cohen, and Sir Barrington Simeon; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 115
WAR RISKS (NATIONAL INSURANCE)—Questions, Mr. Arnold-Forster and Sir G. Baden-Powell; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 118
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS (PENSION FUND)—Question, Mr. Coghill; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury... 118
TURCO-GREEK WAR—Questions, Mr. J. Morley; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 119
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. J. Morley, Mr. J. P. Farrell, and Mr. Lough; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 119

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (MORNING SITTINGS ON TUESDAY):—Resolved, "That, unless the House otherwise order, the House do meet on Tuesdays at Two of the clock."—*(First Lord of the Treasury)* 120

[*May* 10.] *Page*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—Notices of Motion ... 121

Mr. Speaker ... ... 122 *Sir H. Fowler* 122

Bill considered in Committee 122

Clause 1—(Power to increase Grant under 33 & 34 Vict. c. 75 s. 97) ... 122

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (2), after the word "required," to insert the words, "and actually paid to the Treasurer."—*(Mr. Yoxall)* 123

Amendment withdrawn 123

Amendment proposed,—

"In calculating for the purpose of Section 97 of the Act the annual expenses of the School Board, the Education Act shall include such sum as is necessary for maintaining such working balance as the Education Department determine to be necessary—*(Sir J. Gorst)* 123

Amendment, as amended, put and agreed to 126

Clause 2,—(Commencement, Construction, and Short Title)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 134

New Clause proposed,—(Control of Education Department over Rate of Expenditure)—*(Viscount Cranborne)* 134

Question put, "That the Clause be Read a Second time." The Committee divided:—Ayes, 20; Noes, 294.—(Division List, No. 199.) Preamble agreed to. Bill reported, with an Amendment—(237) ... 151

WAYS AND MEANS (BUDGET RESOLUTIONS):—Considered in Committee.

Motion made,—

TEA.—"That the Duty of Customs now payable on Tea shall continue to be charged, levied, and paid on and after the First day of August, One thousand eight and ninety-seven, until the First day of August, One thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the importation thereof into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say): Tea . . the pound . Four Pence"—*(Chancellor of the Exchequer)* 152

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "Four Pence," and to insert instead thereof the words "Two Pence"—*(Mr. Arthur O'Connor)* 152

Question put, "That the words 'four pence' stand part of the Question." The Committee divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 95.—(Division List, No. 200.)—Main Question put and agreed to 177

Metropolitan and other Police Courts Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [3rd May] further adjourned 177

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 178

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill:—After short Debate, Read a Second time, and committed 178

[*May* 10.]

Page

SUPPLY [7TH MAY] :—Resolutions reported—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897–8.

Class II,—

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,485, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords" 178

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,074, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council" 178

Resolutions agreed to 178

Volunteers Bill :—Committee (Progress, 10th May) 178

Clause 1,—(Explanation of 26 and 27 Vic., c. 65 ss. 24, 27.)

Amendment proposed, after the word "power" to insert the words "and approved by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department"—*(Mr. Pickersgill)* 179

Progress reported 180

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 180

Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 180

Law of Evidence (Criminal Cases) Bill :—Committee deferred 180

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—Second Reading deferred 181

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Committee deferred 181

Berriew School Bill :—Third Reading deferred 181

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] :—Second Reading deferred... 181

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 181

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill :—Second Reading deferred 181

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 181

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 181

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 181

Married Persons' Small Industrial Incomes (Tax Relief) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Highways Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Local Authorities (Scotland) Loans Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Registration of Firms Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Sale of Distress Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Chaff-Cutting Machines Accidents Bill :—Committee deferred 182

Tithe Redemption Bill :—Second Reading deferred 182

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 182

[*May* 11.] *Page*

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 182

Canals Protection (London) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 182

Mersey Channels Bill:—After short Debate, Third Reading deferred 183

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 183

Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill:—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 183

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 183

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 183

MONEY LENDING:—Select Committee on Money Lending nominated ... 183

MOTION.

Polling Arrangements (London) Bill:—To make further provision with respect to the arrangement of Polling Districts in the Administrative County of London; presented, and Read the First time.—(No. 238) 184

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE:—Questions, Sir J. Brunner, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Kilbride; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 184

LORDS: TUESDAY, 11TH MAY 1897.

Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act (1888) Amendment Bill:—Reported from the Standing Committee with Amendments.—[No. 74] 185

Trusts (Scotland) Bill:—Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment 185

Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill:—Considered in Committee:—

Clause 1,—(Specification of Divisions for the Purposes of the Act)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 185

Clause 2,—(Provision for Lodging Notice of Bills of Indictment and Criminal Trials)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 185

Clause 3,—(Jurors to be Relieved from Attendance in Certain Cases) ... 186

Amendment proposed—*(Lord Morris)* 186

Amendment agreed to, and inserted as a new clause (Clause 4) after Clause 3 186

New clause proposed—*(Lord Morris)*—Withdrawn 187

Clause 4,—(Power to Adjourn Trials) 187

Amendment proposed—*(Earl of Denbigh)*—Agreed to; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill... 188

[*May* 11.] *Page*

Clause 5,—(Rules. 40 & 41 Vict. c. 56)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 188

Clause 6,—(Definitions)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 188

Clause 7,—(Short Title and Extent of Act)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 188

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee.—[No. 75] 189

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.] :—Read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 189

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 11TH MAY 1897.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

BRITISH AND COLONIAL TRADE :—*(Sir H. Vincent)* 189

RAILWAY RATES (IRELAND) :—*(Mr. Farrell)* 189

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE (LEWIS)—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 189

UPPER DIVISION CLERKS (CHARITY COMMISSION)—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 190

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (EXAMINERS)—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Vice President of the Council 191

LAND COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 192

EVICTION (LITTLEDALE ESTATE, CO. WICKLOW)—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 192

CONGO STATE—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 193

EXPULSION OF MR. MACPHERSON FROM PARIS—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 193

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Daly; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 194

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY (TULLYVIN, CO. CAVAN)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 195

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Under Secretary for War 195

ALDERSHOT CAMP SEWAGE FARM—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, Under Secretary for War 196

BONA FIDE TRAVELLERS (BALLYBUNION, CO. KERRY)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 196

PORT OF NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Anstruther 197

MINES AND QUARRIES (STATISTICS)—Question, Mr. David Thomas; Answer, Home Secretary 197

[*May* 11.] *Page*

ARDAGH BURIAL GROUND—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 198

WAR RISKS (BRITISH SHIPS)—Questions, Mr. O'Kelly and Mr. William Allan; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 199

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Questions, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Daly, and Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 199

CAPE GARRISON—Question, Mr. MacNeill; Answer, Under Secretary for War 200

GREECE AND THE POWERS—Questions, Mr. J. Morley; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 201

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. J. Morley and Mr. Dillon; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 203

Shops (Early Closing) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 203

Sunday Closing Bill:—Second Reading deferred 203

Injuries to Workmen (Employers' Liability) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 204

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March]... 204

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 204

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 204

MOTION.

Commons (Regulation) Bill:—To abolish the Veto of the Lord of the Manor on the Regulation of a Common, under the Commons Act 1876; presented and read the First time—(240) 204

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—As amended, considered 204

WAYS AND MEANS [10th May] (BUDGET RESOLUTION):—Resolution reported (Tea) and agreed to.—Order made accordingly 205

Finance Bill:—To grant certain duties of Customs and Inland Revenue; presented, and Read the First time—(241) 205

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Metropolitan and other Police Courts Bill:—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd May], "That the Bill be now read a Second time." Debate resumed.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Pickersgill*) 205

Mr. Harrison 207
Mr. Stuart 210
Mr. Bartley 212
Mr. Caldwell 213
Mr. Gray 215
Mr. Lough 215
Under Secretary for the Home Department ... 207, 216, 217
Mr. Buxton 218
Mr. Stuart-Wortley 219

[*May* 11.]

Page

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question." The House divided :—Ayes, 235 ; Noes, 87.—(Division List, No. 201) 220

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a Second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, Etc. 220

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] :—Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time" 220

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words, "upon this day six months"—(*Mr. Gibson Bowles*) 221

[*Mr. Speaker* ... ... 222]
Mr. Bartley 224
Mr. Luttrell 225
Mr. Henniker Heaton ... 225
Sir R. Reid 225
Mr. Ambrose 227
Sir C. Cameron 227
Mr. Maurice Healy 228
Solicitor General 229

Amendment withdrawn ; Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a Second time, and committed 231

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—Motion made, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."—*(President of the Board of Agriculture)* 231

Bill read a Second time, and committed 232

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill :—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment ; Read the Third time, and passed 232

Volunteers Bill :—Considered in Committee ...

Clause 1,—(Explanation of 26 and 27 Vict. c. 65, ss. 24, 27) 232

Amendment proposed, to add to the clause the following words :—

"Provided that, notwithstanding anything contained in Section fifty-two of the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1879, the provisions of Section four of the said Act respecting the mitigation of penalties by the court, and that the corresponding provisions of Section six of the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Act 1881, notwithstanding anything contained in the last named section, shall respectively apply to proceedings taken under this Act."—*(Mr. Pickersgill)* ... 233

Question put, "That those words be there added." The Committee divided :—Ayes, 93 ; Noes, 201.—(Division List, No. 202.)—Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill. 234

Clause 2,—(Short Title)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 234

New Clause proposed, —(Termination of Imprisonment) —*(Mr. Pickersgill)* 234

Clause Read First and Second time, and ordered to stand part of the Bill. Bill reported as amended 234

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Considered in Committee

Clause 1,—(Appeal in cases stated in civil matters) 234

Amendment proposed, after the word "made," to insert the words, "after the passing of the Act."—*(Mr. Maurice Healy)* 235

Amendment agreed to ; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill 235

Clause 2,—(Short Title)—Ordered to stand part of the Bill 235

Bill reported as amended 237

[*May* 11.] *Page*

Berriew School Bill:—Third Reading deferred 237

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 237

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill:—Second Reading deferred 237

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 237

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—Debate adjourned 237

EVENING SITTING.

Speeches in Parliament:—Motion made,—

"That the duration of speeches in this House has increased, is increasing, and should be abated."—*(Major Rasch)* 238

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke ... 241
Sir J. Fergusson... ... 242
Sir E. Lees 243
Mr. Hobhouse 243
Mr. Webster 244
Mr. Morrison 244

The House divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 24.—(Division List, No. 203) 245

Incorporated Law Society (Judicial Duties' Expense):—Motion made,—

"That this House is of opinion that a portion of the expenses incurred by the Incorporated Law Society, in fulfilling the duties imposed upon it by the Statute 51 and 52 Vic. c. 65, should be defrayed out of public funds."—*(Mr. Harrison)* 245

Mr. W. Ambrose... ... 246
Mr. Bucknill 246
Mr. Mellor 247
Mr. Gibson Bowles ... 247
Sir E. Clarke... 251
Sir H. Fowler 252
Chancellor of the Exchequer ... 254

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 16.—(Division List, No. 204.) 256

Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 256

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—

Motion made,—

"That the Bill be now read a Second time"—*(Mr. Thornton)* 256

Mr. Jeffreys 257
Mr. Grant Lawson ... 258
Mr. Cawley 258
Mr. Hobhouse 258
Mr. J. P. Farrell ... 259
Mr. Ascroft 259
Mr. H. J. Wilson 260
Mr. Banbury 260
Mr. Clough 260
Mr. Loyd 261
Mr. Daly 261

Mr. R. G. Webster claimed to move, "That the question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.—Debate resumed 262

Question put, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—The House divided, and Mr. Percy Thornton, one of the Tellers for the Ayes, announced the result as follows:—Ayes, 40; Noes, 40 262

Page

Mr. Speaker gave his vote with the Ayes, and declared that the Ayes had it 262

[NOTE.—The Division List, No. 205, shows—Ayes, 44; Noes, 40] ... 263

Bill read a Second time, and committed 263

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill:—Second Reading deferred 263

Midwives' Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred 263

Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 263

Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 263

Teind Court (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 264

Trawlers' Licensing Bill:—Second Reading deferred 264

Shops Bill:—Second Reading deferred 264

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 264

COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 12TH MAY 1897.

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Error in Division (11th May), as announced by Tellers, explained and corrected in the Journal 265

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill:—

Motion made,—

"That the Bill be now read a Second time."—*(Mr. Lecky)* 266

Mr. Jordan 272

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—*(Mr. Daly)* 273

Major Jameson ... 275 *First Lord of the Treasury* ... 289
Mr. Rentoul ... ... 279 *Mr. J. Morley* 292
Mr. Harrington ... 283 *Mr. John Redmond* 293
Mr. Maurice Healy ... 286 *Sir J. Haslett* 297

Sir Thomas Lea claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question 300

Mr. Samuel Young ... 300 *Mr. J. P. Farrell* 301

Mr. William Johnston claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question 303

Mr. J. Wilson (Govan) 303 *Colonel Saunderson* 304
Mr. Clancy ... ... 303 *Mr. Patrick O'Brien* 306

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."—The House divided:—Ayes, 201; Noes, 172. (Division List—No. 206—appended) 306

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a Second time, and committed 309

[*May* 12.] *Page*

Land Values (Towns) Assessment Bill:—Second Reading deferred 309

Employers' Liability for Injuries to Workmen Bill:—Second Reading deferred 309

Corn Sales Bill:—Second Reading deferred 309

Accountants (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 309

Trout Fishing Close Time (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... ... 309

Unlawful Possession Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [29th January] further adjourned 310

Registration of Parliamentary Voters Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 310

Local Government Act (1894) Amendment (No. 2) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 310

Accountants Bill:—Second Reading deferred 310

Building Feus and Leases (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 310

Boiler Inspection and Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred 310

Borough Funds Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

Rivers Pollution Prevention Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

Justices of the Peace Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

Local Government (County Council Clerks) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 311

Police Pensions and Service Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

WAYS AND MEANS:—Committee deferred 311

SUPPLY:—Committee deferred 311

Registration of Firms Bill:—Second Reading deferred 311

Chaff-Cutting Machines Accidents Bill:—Order for Committee read, and discharged. Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. 311

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 311

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 312

Volunteers Bill:—As amended, considered... 312

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Committee deferred 312

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill:—Second Reading deferred 312

Trawlers' Licensing Bill:—Second Reading deferred 312

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 312

MOTIONS.

Colonial Solicitors' Bill :—To provide for the admission of Solicitors of Courts of British Possessions to the Supreme Courts in the United Kingdom; presented, and Read the First time.—(244) 312

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill :—To amend the Local Government Act 1888; presented, and Read the First time.—(245) 312

LORDS: THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 1897.

Copyright (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]:—Bill to amend the law relating to copyright in periodical works, lectures, abridgments, and otherwise, presented by Lord Monkswell, and Read 1ª.—(No. 79) 313

East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill :—Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 313

Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill :—Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 313

Infant Life Protection Bill [H.L.]:—Considered in Committee 314

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill 314

Clause 3,—(Appointment and Powers of Inspectors, etc.) 315

Amendment proposed—*(Lord Belper)*—agreed to; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill 315

Clauses 4 and 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill 317

Clause 6,—(Removal of Infant improperly kept) 317

Amendment proposed—*(Earl of Denbigh)*—agreed to; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill 318

Clauses 7 to 15 (inclusive) ordered to stand part of the Bill 321

New Clause—(Application to Ireland)—*(Earl of Denbigh)*—ordered to stand part of the Bill 321

Clauses 16 and 17 ordered to stand part of the Bill 322

Schedule amended, and ordered to stand part of the Bill; Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee.—(No. 80) 322

Conveyancing Bill [H.L.]:—After short Debate, Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee 325

Archdeaconry of Cornwall Bill :—Considered in Committee; Reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 327

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1875) Amendment Bill:—Considered in Committee; Reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 327

Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act (1888) Amendment Bill :—Amendment reported 327

Trusts (Scotland) Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed 328

[*May* 13.] Page

Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]:—Motion for leave to present Bill.—*(Secretary for Scotland)* 328

Lord Tweedmouth ... 336 *Secretary for Scotland* ... 337
Earl of Camperdown ... 337 *Lord Morris* 337

Bill for improving and extending the procedure for obtaining Parliamentary powers by way of Provisional Orders in matters relating to Scotland; presented, and Read 1ª.—(No. 81) 338

LAND VALUATION (IRELAND):—
Viscount Clifden ... 338 *Earl Spencer* 340
Earl of Denbigh ... 339

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into consideration" 340

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now taken into consideration," in order to add instead thereof the words "re-committed to a Select Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection."—*(Mr. Bryce)* ... 340

Sir Donald Currie ... 342 *Mr. Haldane* 347
Sir J. Leng ... ... 342 *Mr. A. Cross* 348
Mr. Renshaw ... ... 344 *Lord Advocate* 349
Sir C. Dalrymple ... 344 *Mr. Weir* 350
Mr. Mellor ... ... 344 *Mr. Channing* 351
Sir J. Kinloch ... ... 345 *Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell* ... 351
Mr. J. W. Lowther ... 346

Question put, "That the words 'now taken into consideration' stand part of the Question." The House divided:—Ayes, 159; Noes, 175.—(Division List, No. 207) 352

Words amended, by adding, at the end thereof, the words "and that the Promoters of the Bill have leave to appear by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents."—*(Mr. J. W. Lowther)*—Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to 352

East London Water Bill:—

Motion made,—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the East London Water Bill that they have power to insert a clause providing that the term 'the annual rateable value of the tenement supplied with water' shall have the same meaning in the districts outside the metropolis supplied by the company as the term now has within the metropolitan area."—*(Mr. Gray)*... 353

Colonel Lockwood ... 356 *President Local Government Board* 359
Mr. Warner ... ... 358 *Mr. Gray* 360
Mr. Banbury 358

Motion withdrawn 360

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.]:—Read the First time.—(248) 360

[*May* 13.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

Plymouth Harbour Works—Question, Mr. Mildmay; Answer, Civil Lord of the Admiralty 360

Army (Small Arms Ammunition)—Question, Sir A. F. Acland-Hood; Answer, Under Secretary for War 360

Vaccination (Royal Commission)—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 361

Exchange Compensation (India)—Questions, Sir Seymour King and Sir William Wedderburn; Answers, Secretary of State for India 361

Brigade of Guards—Questions, Sir A. Acland-Hood and Sir C. Dilke; Answers, Under Secretary for War 362

Land Sub-Commission—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Young; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 363

Land Commissioners—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 364

Army Horses—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Sir H. Vincent; Answers, Under Secretary for War 364

Parliamentary Correspondence (Postage)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 365

Commissioners of Public Works (Ireland)—Question, Mr. J. Dillon; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 366

Science and Art Schools (Grants)—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Vice President of the Council 367

Weighing of Cattle (Scotland)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, President of the Board of Agriculture 367

Post Office Savings Bank—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 368

Parish Councils (Scotland)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 368

Public Works (Scotland)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 369

Port Ness New Harbour (Lewis)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 369

Telegraph Offices (Public Guarantee)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 370

Post Office (Delivery of Letters)—Question, Mr. Jeffreys; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 370

Telegraphic Addresses—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 370

Telegraph Charges—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 371

Rating Assessment—Question, Mr. Finch-Hatton; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 371

Post Office (Gratuities to Postmen)—Question, Mr. Finch-Hatton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 372

Voluntary Schools Act—Questions, Mr. Gray and Mr. Mellor; Answers, Vice President of the Council 373

Deportation of Paupers—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 374

Queen's Diamond Jubilee—Questions, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Isaacson, Mr. Grant Lawson, Sir J. Brunner, Mr. W. Johnston, Sir Elliott Lees, and Mr. MacNeill; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury, Secretary to the Treasury, Under Secretary for War, and First Commissioner of Works 374

Royal Patriotic Fund—Question, Mr. Kearley; Answer, Under Secretary for War 376

[*May* 13.] Page

NOTIFICATION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES ACT—Question, Sir J. Brunner; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 377

CASHEN RIVER, BALLYBUNION—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 377

WATERFORD, DUNGARVAN, AND LISMORE RAILWAY—Question, Mr. Power; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 378

TELEGRAPH OFFICE (DUNGENESS)—Question, Sir H. Vincent; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 378

COUNTY COUNCIL (ACCOUNTS)—Question, Mr. Strachey; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 378

TELEGRAPH POSTS (YEOVIL)—Question, Mr. Strachey; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 379

SCOTCH HERRINGS (ST. PETERSBURG)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 380

CRETE—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 380

GAMBLING RAID (HULL)—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Home Secretary 381

REVENUE (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND)—Question, Mr. J. Morley; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 382

ANCIENT MONUMENTS (INDIA)—Question, Sir W. Wedderburn; Answer, Secretary of State for India 383

SALT DUTY (INDIA)—Question, Sir W. Wedderburn; Answer, Secretary of State for India 384

ESTATES RETURN (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 384

IRISH ACTS (CODIFICATION)—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, Attorney General for Ireland 384

MATABELELAND AND MASHONALAND—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Under Secretary for War 385

VETERINARY COLLEGE, DUBLIN—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 386

BLACKROCK TOWNSHIP COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 386

LOUGHSHINNY PIER (CO. DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 387

BALBRIGGAN HARBOUR—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 388

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Renshaw; Answer, Lord Advocate 388

POSTMEN (CORK)—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 388

START BAY (REMOVAL OF SAND)—Question, Mr. Mildmay; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 389

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GRANT)—Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 389

ORDNANCE SURVEY (CO. MAYO)—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 389

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT—Question, Mr. Jeffreys; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 390

MIDWIVES' REGISTRATION ACT—Question, Mr. Hazell; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 390

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION (SCOTLAND)—Questions, Mr. Hedderwick; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 391

WALLACE BEQUEST (MANCHESTER HOUSE)—Questions, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring and Dr. Farquharson; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 391

[*May* 13.] *Page*

South Kensington Museum—Questions, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. Mundella, and Mr. Bartley; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury ... 392

Greco-Turkish War—Questions, Mr. J. Morley; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 393

Business of the House—Questions, Mr. J. Morley, Mr. J. Lowther, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Lough, Mr. Weir, and Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 393

Plumbers' Registration Bill:—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.—(249) 394

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill:—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.—(250)... 394

MOTION.

Post Office (Sites) Bill:—To enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands in London, Brighton, Norwich, Plymouth, Southampton, Oban, and Cork for the public service, and to confirm agreements in relation to the Aldersgate Public Garden or Postmen's Park, and for other purposes; presented, and Read the First time.—(251) 395

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill:—

Motion made—

"That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—*(President of the Board of Trade)* 395

Mr. Dalziel 399
Mr. Whittaker 404
Sir H. Vincent 407
Mr. Pickersgill 411
Mr. Burns 413
Mr. Quilter 416
[*Mr. Speaker* ... ... 417]
Mr. E. Robertson ... 418
Mr. Cochrane 421
Mr. J. Samuel 422
Secretary of State for the Colonies 423
Mr. Bryce 435
Mr. S. Hoare 442
Mr. Allan 443
Mr. J. Lowles... 444
Sir J. Brunner 445

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."—The House divided:—Ayes, 221; Noes, 90.—(Division List—No. 208—appended) 446

Main Question put, and agreed to.—Bill Read a Second time 447

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc." 447

Debate adjourned 448

Business of the House:—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury and Secretary to the Treasury 449

[*May* 13.] *Page*

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—Third Reading deferred 449

Extraordinary Tithe Bill:—Committee deferred 449

Volunteers Bill:—Third Reading deferred 449

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill:—As amended, considered ... 449

Dangerous Performances Bill:—Second Reading deferred 449

Public Offices (Whitehall) Site (Re-Committed) Bill:—Committee deferred 449

Patent Office Extension (Re-Committed) Bill:—Committee deferred 450

Finance Bill:—Second Reading deferred 450

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.]:—Committee deferred 450

Berriew School Bill:—Third Reading deferred 450

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 450

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 450

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 450

SUPPLY:—Committee deferred 450

Rating of Machinery Suspensory Bill:—Second Reading deferred 450

Idiots' Institutions (Exemption from Rates) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 450

Prisoners' Personal Correction Prohibition Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 451

Election Petitions Bill:—Second Reading deferred 451

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 451

Shop Assistants (Half-Holiday) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 451

Estates Tail Bill:—Second Reading deferred 451

Industries (Ireland) (Re-Committed) Bill:—Considered in Committee, and reported 451

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill:—Read a Second time, and committed 451

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 451

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 451

Mersey Channels Bill:—Read the Third time, and passed 452

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill:—Considered in Committee. Clause 1. Committee report progress 452

Corn Sales Bill:—Second Reading deferred 452

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill:—Read a Second time, and committed ... 452

[*May* 14.] Page

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 452

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 452

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill :—Second Reading deferred 452

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 452

LORDS: FRIDAY, 14TH MAY 1897.

SAT FIRST :—Lord Lilford—after the death of his father 453

SECONDARY EDUCATION :—Notice of Question—*(Lord Norton)* 453

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Dublin Corporation Bill :—Read a Second time 453

Marquess of Londonderry moved Instruction 453

Earl of Morley ... ... 457 *Lord Chancellor* 461
Earl of Mayo ... ... 459 *Earl of Kimberley* 462
Earl of Belmore... ... 460 *Duke of Rutland* 462
Earl of Denbigh... ... 461 *Marquess of Londonderry* ... 462

The House divided on the Motion, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to whom the Bill shall be referred to omit Part IV. and Schedules" :—Contents, 66; Not-Contents, 48.—(Division List appended)... 463

Resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly 464

Juries Detention Bill :—Committee put off 464

Mersey Channels Bill :—Brought from the Commons and Read 1ª—(No. 84) ... 464

Fisheries Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.] :—Bill to amend the Fisheries Acts; presented by the Earl of Dudley, and Read 1ª.—(No. 88.) 464

Church Patronage Transfers Bill [H.L.].—After short Debate, Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 465

East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill :—Considered in Committee; reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived 466

Regular and Elders' Widows Bill :—Considered in Committee; reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 466

Archdeaconry of Cornwall Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed 466

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill :—Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 467

[*May* 14.] *Page*

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA (HEALTH):—

Motion made—

"That in view of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the India Office of February 20 1897, it is, in the opinion of this House, urgently necessary that an Inquiry be made into the effect of such diseases upon the Forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within Her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the measures which are, or have been, in force in this and other countries for the prevention of such diseases."—(*Earl of Dunraven*) 467

Lord Roberts of Kandahar 476 *Under Secretary for India* ... 486
Archbishop of Canterbury 483

Debate adjourned 491

Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation Bill:—Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House 491

Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage) Bill:—Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House 491

COMMONS, FRIDAY, 14TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill:—After short Debate, Second Reading deferred till Monday next 491

QUESTIONS.

CAPE GARRISON—Questions, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arnold-Forster, and Mr. MacNeill; Answers, Under Secretary for War [Mr. Speaker] 492

LOUGH MASK AND BALLINROBE CANAL—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 494

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Major Rasch, Colonel Dalbiac, and Mr. MacNeill; Answers, Vice President of the Council, First Commissioner of Works, and First Lord of the Treasury 494

GOVERNMENT OFFICES (SITES)—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, First Commissioner of Works 495

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. O'Malley, Mr. J. P. Farrell, and Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 496

BROOKEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS — Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 497

HONITON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (HOLY WEEK) — Question, Mr. Carvell Williams; Answer, Vice President of the Council 498

CORK AND TRALEE PRISONS—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 498

ORMATHWAITE PROPERTY (LISTOWEL)—Questions, Mr. Flavin; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 498

POSTAL DELIVERIES (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 499

[*May* 14.] *Page*

DISCHARGE OF WEAVERS (BURNLEY)—Question, Mr. Stanhope; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 500
ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Lord Advocate 500
DOG LICENCE (DRUMLITHIE, KINCARDINESHIRE)—Question, Mr. Crombie; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 501
AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 501
TECHNICAL EDUCATION—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Vice President of the Council 502
BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA (HEALTH)—Question, Mr. Stuart-Wortley; Answer, Secretary of State for India 502
SEED POTATOES SUPPLY (IRELAND) ACT 1895—Questions, Mr. Hammond; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 503
HIGH SHERIFF (CARRICKFERGUS)—Question, Mr. Dane; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 504
WORMWOOD SCRUBS—Question, Mr. Sharpe; Answer, Under Secretary for War 504
POTATO CROP (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. McDermott and Captain Donelan; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 504
JOINT BURIAL COMMITTEES—Question, Mr. Heywood Johnstone; Answer, Secretary to the Local Government Board 505
PERFORMING BEARS (STREETS)—Question, Colonel Dalbiac; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 506
SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 506
WESTMINSTER HALL—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, First Commissioner of Works 506
ROYAL MARINES (RESERVE)—Question, Admiral Field; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 507
LAUNDRY WORKERS—Question, Mr. Lloyd-George; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 507
CIVIL (UNCOVENANTED) SERVICE (INDIA)—Question, Mr. Barnes; Answer, Secretary of State for India 507
CRETE—Question, Mr. John Dillon; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 508
PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS' LISTS (REVISION)—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 508
DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Lord Advocate .. 509
LAND COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Patrick M'Hugh; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 509
INEBRIATES (REFORMATORIES)—Questions, Dr. Farquharson; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 510
POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Lough; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 511
ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND—Question, Mr. A. Brookfield; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 511
SUPPLY (WAR OFFICE VOTE)—Question, Sir A. Acland-Hood; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury... 512

MOTION.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill:—To Amend the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act 1877; presented, and Read a First time—(253) 512

[*May* 17.] *Page*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—[Eighth Allotted Day]:—Considered in Committee 512

Civil Service Estimates, 1897–8.

Class III,—

£68,431, to complete the sum for the Irish Land Commission 512

Motion made to report Progress—*(Mr. Flynn)* 558

Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 119.—(Division List, No. 209) 563

Progress reported 579

Industries (Ireland) (Re-Committed) Bill:—As amended, considered; Bill Read the Third time, and passed 580

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill:—Committee deferred 580

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 580

Parliamentary Election Petitions:—Select Committee appointed to inquire into the procedure and practice on Parliamentary Election Petitions, and to report to the House if any changes are desirable therein ... 580

Business of the House:—Statement by First Lord of the Treasury ... 580

LORDS: MONDAY, 17th MAY 1897.

Industries (Ireland) Bill:—Brought from the Commons and Read 1a—(No. 89) ... 581

British Troops in India (Health):—Debate resumed on Motion of the Earl of Dunraven to resolve:—

"That in view of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the India Office of the 20th Day of February 1897, it is, in the opinion of this House, urgently necessary that an Inquiry be made into the effect of contagious diseases upon the Forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within Her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the measures which are or have been in force in this and other countries for the prevention of such diseases"

Lord Reay 581
Lord Lister 583
Lord Playfair 589
Duke of Cambridge ... 593
Bishop of Southwell ... 597
Secretary of State for War ... 599
Earl of Kimberley 606
Lord Clarina 610
Earl of Dunraven 611

Motion withdrawn 612

Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act (1888) Amendment Bill:—Read 3a (according to Order), with the Amendment; passed, and returned to the Commons ... 612

East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill:—Read 3a (according to Order), and passed 612

[*May* 17.] *Page*

Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill:—Read 3a (according to Order), and passed 612

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holiday) Bill:—Considered in Committee; reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 613

Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation Bill:—Considered in Committee; reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 613

Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage) Bill:—Considered in Committee; reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 613

COMMONS: MONDAY, 17TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill:—Read a Second time.—Instruction—(*Mr. Crilly*)—Agreed to 613

QUESTIONS.

HERRINGS (IMPORTED)—Question, Sir C. Cameron; Answer, Lord Advocate 614
LETTERS FOR HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 614
WATER SUPPLY (LONDON)—Questions, Mr. Samuel and Mr. Lough; Answer, President of the Local Government Board [Mr. Speaker] 615
LONDON WATER SUPPLY—Question, Mr. Samuel; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 616
SUNKEN WRECKS (PLYMOUTH FISHING GROUND)—Questions, Mr. Harrison and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, President of the Board of Trade ... 616
BRIGADE OF GUARDS (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT)—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, Under Secretary for War 617
LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 617
TELEGRAM (NON-DELIVERY)—Question, Mr. Bryn Roberts; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 618
NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' FUND (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 619
LAND COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. Flynn, Mr. T. M. Healy, and Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 620
CIVIL SERVICE (SECOND DIVISION CLERKS)—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 622
BOILER EXPLOSIONS ACTS—Question, Sir William Houldsworth; Answer, Home Secretary 623
LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND)—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 623
WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL—Questions, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir C. Dilke, and Mr. Havelock Wilson; Answers, Home Secretary and First Lord of the Treasury 623

[*May* 17.] *Page*

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. MacNeill and Mr. Dane; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 624
STAMP DUTY (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Macaleese, Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 625
ORDNANCE SURVEY (MAYO)—Question, Mr. J. Dillon; Answer, President of the Board of Agriculture 626
CRETE—Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 626
LETTERS (OFFICIAL POSTMARKS)—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 627
POST CARDS—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 627
BOARD OF GUARDIANS (PUBLIC BILLS)—Question, Sir William Houldsworth; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 628
CHITRAL MEDAL—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, Secretary of State for India 629
DELIVERY OF LETTERS—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 629
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Lowles, Mr. Carew, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Home Secretary and Secretary to the Treasury 629
POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 631
DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Lord Advocate 631
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (AGE CLAUSE)—Question, Mr. Spicer; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 631
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON BILL—Question, Mr. Brynmor Jones; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 632
DURATION OF SPEECHES (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 632
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Herbert Roberts, Mr. Courtney, and Mr. Brynmor Jones; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 632
CREWE (REPRESENTATION)—Questions, Mr. MacNeill; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury [Mr. Speaker] 634

Coal Mines Regulation Bill:—Second Reading deferred 635
Truck Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred 635
Pensions (Old Age) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 635
Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [H.L.]:—Read the First time.—(255) ... 635

MOTIONS.

School Boards' Expenses Bill:—To provide for expenses incurred by School Boards in relation to School Board Conferences.—(256) 635

Poor Law Bill:—To amend the law with respect to the borrowing of money by Guardians and Managers of District Schools and Asylums, and to explain the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867; presented, and Read the First time.—(257) 635

[*May* 17.] *Page*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill :—Motion made, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time." 636

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add instead thereof the words

"no Bill dealing with accidents to workmen will be satisfactory to this House which does not provide for the prevention of accidents as well as for compensation in case of injury."—*(Mr. Geoffrey Drage)* 636

Sir F. Powell 644
Mr. Bainbridge 644
Mr. Woods 653
Mr. Seton-Karr 655
Sir C. Dilke 658
Sir E. Hill 665
Mr. Broadhurst 667
Mr. Strauss 670
Mr. Atherley-Jones ... 673
Mr. Helder 676
Mr. Ascroft 676
[*Mr. Speaker* ... ... 680]
Mr. Pickersgill 681
Mr. J. Wilson (Falkirk Burghs) 686
Mr. Birrell 690
Home Secretary 694
Mr. Burt 704
Mr. Cripps 708

Debate adjourned 712

Foreign Prison Made Goods Bill :—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [13th May], "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc."—Debate, again adjourned 712

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill :—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered 713

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 713

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 713

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.] :—Second Reading deferred 713

Post Office (Sites) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 713

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—Committee deferred 713

Volunteers Bill :—Third Reading deferred 713

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Read the Third time, and passed 713

Dangerous Performances Bill :—Second Reading deferred 713

Public Offices (Whitehall) Site (Re-Committed) Bill :—Committee deferred ... 714

Patent Office Extension (Re-Committed) Bill :—Committee deferred 714

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] :—Committee deferred 714

Berriew School Bill :—Third Reading deferred 714

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 714

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 714

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 714

Finance Bill :—Second Reading deferred 714

[*May* 18.] *Page*

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill :—Third Reading deferred 714

Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 714

Law of Evidence (Criminal Cases) Bill :—Committee deferred 715

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 715

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 715

Local Authorities' Officers' Superannuation Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 715

Highways Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Local Authorities (Scotland) Loans Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Tithe Redemption Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Polling Arrangements (London) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Employers' Liability for Injuries to Workmen Bill :—Second Reading deferred 715

Local Government Act (1886) Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 715

Prisoners' Personal Correction Prohibition Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 716

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 716

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill :—Second Reading deferred 716

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 716

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 716

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 716

Shop Assistants (Half-Holiday) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 716

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill :—Committee deferred 716

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 716

LORDS : TUESDAY, 18TH MAY 1897.

NOTICE OF QUESTION : Secondary Education.—*(Lord Norton)* 717

Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill :—Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment.—(No. 90) 717

Infant Life Protection Bill [H.L.] : Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments.—(No. 91) 717

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1866) Amendment Bill : Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment 717

[*May* 18.] *Page*

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed 717

Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed ... 717

Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage) Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed ... 718

Appeal in certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Read 1ª—*(The Earl of Denbigh)*.—(No. 92) 718

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 18TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Highgate Woods Preservation Bill :—Bill to authorise the acquisition of lands known as Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, for the purposes of a public open space, presented, and Read the First time.—*(Dr. Farquharson)* 718

QUESTIONS.

PRISON CLERKS—Question, Mr. Luttrell; Answer, Home Secretary... ... 718
LOCK HOSPITALS—Questions, Mr. Jeffreys; Answers, Under Secretary for War 719
CONGO STATE—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 720
JUVENILE OFFENDERS—Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Home Secretary... 720
DIVISIONS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—Question, Mr. Crombie; Answer, Sir W. Walrond 721
FLAX (FOREIGN BOUNTIES)—Questions, Mr. Cross; Answers, President of the Board of Trade 721
ARMY SURGEONS (ROYAL CORPS)—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, Under Secretary for War 722
HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 722
GRAND JURY SYSTEM (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 723
CANALS (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 723
MERCANTILE MARINE (FOREIGN OFFICERS AND ENGINEERS)—Questions, Mr. Flannery and Sir A. Forwood; Answers, President of the Board of Trade [Mr. Speaker] 724
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Colonel Milward, Mr. Ascroft, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Flavin; Answers, First Commissioner of Works, Home Secretary, and Civil Lord of the Admiralty 724
LONGFORD CANAL HARBOUR—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland... 726
TELEGRAMS (OLDHAM)—Question, Mr. Ascroft; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 727
CHARGE OF MURDER (CO. TYRONE)—Question, Mr. Murnaghan; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 728
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE BILL (BELGIUM)—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Home Secretary 729

[*May* 18.] *Page*

ARMY REMOUNTS—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Under Secretary for War 729
COVENT GARDEN THEATRE FUND—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 729
MANITOBA (CROFTERS' SETTLEMENTS)—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. Anstruther 730
VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 730
INDIAN AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS—Question, Mr. Havelock Wilson; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 730
POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Question, Mr. Havelock Wilson; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 731
MERCANTILE MARINE (ACCIDENTS TO SEAMEN)—Question, Mr. Havelock Wilson; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 731
BRITISH SEAMEN IN FOREIGN PORTS—Question, Mr. Havelock Wilson; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 732
GIPSIES—Questions, Mr. Skewes-Cox and Mr. MacNeill; Answers, Home Secretary 732
LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 732
SUPPLY (COLONIAL OFFICE VOTE)—Questions, Sir W. Harcourt; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury... 733

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER):—Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order, Sittings of the House.—*(First Lord of the Treasury)* 733

MOTIONS.

Ground Game Act (Extension to Copyholders) Bill:—To extend to Copyholders in certain cases the provisions of the Ground Game Act 1880; presented, and Read the First time.—(258) 734

District Councils (Water Supply Facilities) Bill:—For giving facilities for a pure Water Supply in Rural Districts; presented, and Read the First time.—(259) 734

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill:—To amend section eleven of the Local Government Act 1888; presented, and Read the First time.—(260) 734

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill:—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [17th May], "That the Bill be now Read a Second time, and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add instead the words,—

"no Bill dealing with Accidents to Workmen will be satisfactory to this House which does not provide for the prevention of Accidents as well as for Compensation in case of Injury."—*(Mr. Drage.)*

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."—Debate resumed.

Mr. Tennant	734	*Sir A. Hickman*	777
Mr. Holland	737	*Mr. Logan*	779
Mr. Provand	741	*Sir A. Rollit*	783
Mr. Asquith	747	*Mr. Ashton*	786
Attorney General ...	756	*Secretary of State for the Colonies*	789
Sir J. Brunner	766	*Mr. Broadhurst*	794
Mr. Goulding	766	*Mr. McKenna*...	811
Sir J. Joicey	767	*Colonel Blundell*	812
Mr. Richardson	773	*Mr. Harold Reckitt*	812
Mr. Fenwick	775		

Amendment withdrawn; Bill Read a Second time, and committed ... 813

Elementary Education (Permissive Rates Aid) Bill:—Order for Second Reading Read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 814

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 814

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 814

Church Patronage Transfer Bill:—Second Reading deferred 814

Shops (Early Closing) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 814

Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 814

Shops Bill:—Second Reading deferred 814

Accountants (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 814

Trout Fishing Close Time (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 814

Accountants Bill:—Second Reading deferred 815

Building Feus and Leases (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 815

Registration of Firms Bill:—Second Reading deferred 815

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Considered in Committee.—Clause 1; Committee report Progress 815

Trawlers' Licensing Bill:—Second Reading deferred 815

Archdeaconry of London Additional Endowments Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 815

Sale of Distress Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred 815

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 816

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 816

Volunteers' Bill:—Third Reading deferred 816

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 816

Tithe Redemption Bill:—Second Reading deferred 816

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 816

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill:—Read a Second time, and committed 816

[*May* 19.] Page

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 816

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 816

COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 19TH MAY 1897.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill :—Motion made, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—*(Mr. Vaughan Davies)* 817

Mr. Brynmor Jones 821

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—*(Mr. Milbank)* 828

Sir J. Llewelyn 831
Mr. S. Smith 834
Mr. Stanley Leighton ... 836
Mr. Herbert Roberts ... 841
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 845
Sir W. Hart Dyke ... 847
Mr. Channing 849
Mr. Howell 851
Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... 857
President of the Board of Agriculture 861

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question." The House divided :—Ayes, 154; Noes, 278.—(Division List—No. 210—appended) 866

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Second Reading put off for six months 869

Agricultural Holdings Bill :—Second Reading deferred 869

County Courts Bill :—Second Reading deferred 869

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 869

Jurors' Expenses Bill :—Second Reading deferred 869

Law of Libel Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 870

Merchant Shipping Bill :—Second Reading deferred 870

Cemeteries Rating Bill :—Second Reading deferred 870

Employers' Liability (Foreign Shipowners) Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 870

Commons (Regulation) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 870

Local Government Act (1894) Amendment (No. 2) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Rivers Pollution Prevention Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Police Pensions and Service Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Colonial Solicitors Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Estates Tail Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

[*May* 20.] *Page*

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill :—Considered in Committee. Clause 2,—Committee report Progress 871

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 871

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 871

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Trawlers' Licensing Bill :—Second Reading deferred 871

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 872

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill :—Considered in Committee. Clause 1,—Committee report Progress 872

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 872

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 872

MOTION.

Married Women (Ireland) Bill :—To amend the law relating to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates in reference to married women in Ireland; presented, and Read the First time.—(261) 872

GOVERNMENT OFFICES (APPROPRIATION OF SITES), 1896 :—Order made as to Report 872

LORDS: THURSDAY, 20TH MAY 1897.

Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill :—Order read for Second Reading.

Lord Tweedmouth ... 873 *Secretary for Scotland* ... 887
Earl of Morley ... ... 878 *Lord Herschell* 892
Earl of Camperdown ... 885

Bill Read a Second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 893

Juries Detention Bill :—Considered in Committee, Reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 893

Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill :—Amendments reported 893

Infant Life Protection Bill [H.L.] :—Report of Amendments put off 893

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment Bill :—Read 3ª, and passed 893

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) :—*(Lord Herschell)* 893

Lord Monteagle ... ... 895 *Earl of Denbigh* 896
Earl of Mayo 896

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS :—*(Viscount Templetown)* 896

Earl of Denbigh ... ... 902 *Earl of Mayo...* 902

Page

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 20TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Llandudno Urban District Council Bill:—Considered as amended:—
Clause 2,—(Power to set apart Lands for Games) 903
Amendment proposed in Sub-section (2) to leave out the words "any existing right to military user," in order to insert the words "the military user in case of national or local emergency."—*(Under Secretary of State for War.)* 903
Question put "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill." The House divided:—Ayes, 96; Noes, 124.—(Division List, No. 211). Words inserted 907

QUESTIONS.

FISHERY CRUISERS—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Admiralty 907
CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Advocate 907
BALLINAMORE CANAL—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Dillon; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 908
POST OFFICE (LEWIS)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 909
STAMP ILLUSTRATIONS—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 910
POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Questions, Mr. Lough and Mr. Leuty; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 911
EDUCATION CENTRE SUPERINTENDENTS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 912
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Captain Chaloner, Colonel Lockwood, Sir Seymour King, and Mr. Yoxall; Answers, First Commissioner of Works and Vice President of the Council 913
KASSALA—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 915
QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (MODEL SCHOOLS, IRELAND)—Question, Mr. William Johnston; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland... 915
EVICTION (DURNASCALLON, CO. DERRY)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 915
HONITON NATIONAL SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Carvell Williams; Answer, Vice President of the Council 916
SCHOOL BOARDS (LOANS)—Question, Mr. Carvell Williams; Answer, Vice President of the Council 916
MACROOM GUARDIANS (REMOVAL OF SICK PAUPERS)—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 916
LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Dilon, and Mr. Daly; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 917
TELEGRAPH OFFICE (BALCARRA, CO. MAYO)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 919

[*May* 20.] Page

LLANGOLLEN SCHOOL BOARD—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Vice President of the Council 920

POLLEN ACT (LOUGH NEAGH)—Questions, Mr. Doogan and Mr. Dillon; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 920

CHARGE OF MURDER (OMAGH)—Question, Mr. Knox; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 921

QUEEN'S COLLEGES (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Pinkerton and Mr. W. Johnston; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 922

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 923

PUBLICAN'S LICENCE (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 923

SUPPLY (ORDNANCE FACTORY VOTE)—Question, Lord Hugh Cecil; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 924

INDIAN MIDLAND AND BENGAL-NAGPUR RAILWAYS—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Secretary of State for India 924

LAND COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Dillon and Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 925

TURKO-GREEK WAR—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 926

CHARITY SCHEME (THORNTON-IN-CRAVEN)—Questions, Mr. Stanhope; Answers, Mr. Grant Lawson 927

TELEPHONE SERVICE (GLASGOW)—Question, Mr. Begg; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 928

MOHILL BURIAL GROUND (CO. LEITRIM)—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 928

POST OFFICE (DUNDALK)—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 929

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Murnaghan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 930

DOG MUZZLING—Question, Mr. Logan; Answer, President of the Board of Agriculture 931

CRETE—Question, Mr. H. Roberts; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 931

LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 931

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL—Questions, Mr. Seton-Karr, and Mr. J. Ellis; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury... 932

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS)—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Lord Advocate 934

COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE (EUROPEAN AND INDIAN OFFICIALS)—Questions, Sir William Wedderburn; Answers, Secretary of State for the Colonies and Secretary of State for India 934

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT—Question, Mr. Sidebotham; Answer, Attorney General 935

STATUTE LAW REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION BILLS—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Attorney General 935

LAND RATING (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. Lough, and Mr. Knox; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 936

INDIA (EXPENDITURE)—Question, Mr. Bhownaggree; Answer, Secretary of State for India 936

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL—Question, General Russell; Answer, First Lord of Treasury 937

WHITSUNTIDE HOLIDAYS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—Questions, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Labouchere, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Gibson Bowles, and Mr. Lough; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 937

[*May* 20.] *Page*

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICE VOTES)—Question, Mr. Knox; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 938

DUNGARVAN AND LISMORE RAILWAY—Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 939

Prisons Bill:—Bill to amend the Law relating to Prisons, presented by Home Secretary, and Read the First time.—(262) 939

Police and Stolen Property Bill:—To make further provision with respect to the disposal of Property in the possession of the Police; presented by the Home Secretary, and Read the First time.—(263) 940

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—Order for Third Reading read

Mr. J. Hutton 941
Mr. Perks 942
Colonel Milward ... 944
Mr. Lambert 945
Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth... 947
Vice President of the Council 948
Mr. Acland 950
Mr. Gray 951
Mr. Carvell Williams... ... 952
Mr. Bartley 954

Bill read the Third time 954

Finance Bill:—

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add instead thereof the words—

"in the opinion of this House, the existing fiscal system of the country is unequal to the continually increasing demands of the public service, and that the time has arrived for recourse being had to more varied sources of taxation."—*(Mr. James Lowther)* 954

Mr. Knox 964
Captain Pretyman ... 968
Mr. G. Harwood... ... 979
Mr. Lough 981
Sir H. Maxwell 984
Sir W. Harcourt ... 994
Major Rasch 1009
Sir H. Fowler... 1010
Chancellor of the Exchequer 986, 1011
Mr. Dillon 1011
Sir J. Brunner 1011

Amendment withdrawn; Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read a Second time, and committed 1012

Volunteers Bill:—

Motion made, "That the Bill be now Read a Third time."

After short Debate, the House divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 44.—(Division List, No. 212). Bill Read the Third time, and passed ... 1012

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned 1013

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill:—Third Reading deferred 1013

Berriew School Bill:—Third Reading deferred 1013

[*May* 20.] *Page*

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [H.L.]:—Second Reading deferred ... 1013

School Boards' Expenses Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1013

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.]:—Second Reading deferred 1013

Extraordinary Tithe Bill:—Committee deferred 1013

Public Offices (Whitehall) Site (Re-Committed) Bill:—Committee deferred... 1014

Patent Office Extension (Re-Committed) Bill:—Committee deferred 1014

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1014

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 1014

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1014

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 1014

Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1014

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1014

Cottage Homes Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1014

Midwives' Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1015

Election Petitions Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1015

Corn Sales Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1015

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 1015

Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Bill:—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered 1015

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1015

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 1015

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Committee deferred 1015

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 1015

Colonial Solicitors' Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1016

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) (Amendment) Bill:—Considered in Committee 1016

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1016

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill:—Committee deferred 1016

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1016

BURIAL GROUNDS:—Select Committee nominated... 1016

Page

LORDS: FRIDAY, 21st MAY 1897.

Lunacy Bill:—Bill to amend the Lunacy Acts—presented by the Lord Chancellor, and Read 1a.—(No. 93.) 1017

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill:—Read 2a, and committed ... 1017

Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill:—Read 3a, with the Amendments; passed, and returned to the Commons 1017

Elementary Education Act, 1870, Amendment Bill:—Read 1a—(*The Lord President*).—(No. 95) 1017

Volunteers Bill:—Read 1a—(No. 96) 1017

SECONDARY EDUCATION:—

Lord Norton ... ... 1017 *Lord President of the Council* 1019

Infant Life Protection Bill [H.L.]:—Amendments reported 1020

Clause 10,—(Prosecution of Offences)—

Amendment proposed, after the word "prosecuted," to insert the words "and any forfeiture recoverable."—(*Earl of Denbigh*)—Agreed to 1020

New Clause proposed—(*Earl of Denbigh*) 1020

Clause read First and Second time, and ordered to stand part of the Bill.—(No. 94)... 1021

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 21st MAY 1897.

NEW WRIT:—For the County of Hants (Eastern or Petersfield Division) *v.* William Wickham, esquire, deceased.—(*Sir William Walrond*) ... 1021

Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill:—Committee deferred 1021

QUESTIONS.

VICTORIA CROSS (TROOPER BAXTER)—Question, General Laurie; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1021

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1022

TECHNICAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1023

LOCAL LOAN FUND—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1023

AGRICULTURAL RATING ACT (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Lough; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1024

KERRY ESTATES (RECEIVER)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1024

FUGITIVE SLAVES (ZANZIBAR COAST)—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1025

MARYBOROUGH GAOL (PRISONER THOMAS COLLINS)—Questions, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1025

DOG LICENCE (GOVAN)—Question, Mr. J. Wilson (Govan); Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1026

[*May* 21.] *Page*

KERRY GRAND JURY—Questions, Mr. Flavin; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1026
EDUCATION OFFICE (DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1027
POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1028
ITALIAN ICE-CREAM VENDORS—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 1028
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Aird, Mr. Carvell Williams, Mr. Macdona, and Mr. Yoxall; Answers, First Commissioner of Works, Under Secretary for Home Department, Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Vice President of the Council... 1029
RATHKEALE UNION (ELECTION OF GUARDIAN)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1030
MULLINGAR UNION—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1031
LARCENY (ALLEGED) CO. TYRONE—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland... 1032
PARCEL POST—Question, Mr. Henniker-Heaton; Answer Secretary to the Treasury 1032
TELEGRAPH CHARGES—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1033
PROBATION OF FIRST OFFENDERS ACT—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Under Secretary for the Home Department 1033
BANKRUPTCY COURT (IRELAND)—Question, Major Jameson; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1034
BRUSSELS ACT—Questions, Sir J. Kennaway and Sir C. Dilke; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1034
DEATH OF PAUPER (CITY OF LONDON)—Question, Mr. Crilly; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 1035
TOKAT MASSACRE—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1036
SCIENCE AND ART CLASSES (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Vice-President of the Council 1036
PETTY SESSIONS (MAGISTERIAL JURISDICTION)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1037
ADMINISTRATION OF OATH (COURT OF JUSTICE)—Question, Sir W. Foster; Answer, Attorney General... 1037
JUDICIARY (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Flynn and Captain Donelan; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1038
BENEFICES BILL—Questions, Viscount Cranborne; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1038
ARMISTICE—Question, Mr. Scott; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1039

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND).—MINISTERIAL PROPOSALS:—(*First Lord of the Treasury*) 1040

Mr. Carson 1046
Mr. Dillon 1048
Colonel Saunderson ... 1049
Mr. T. M. Healy... ... 1050
Sir J. Lubbock 1051
Mr. Rentoul 1051
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman... 1053
Mr. Bartley 1054
Mr. J. Redmond 1055
Sir R. Penrose-Fitzgerald ... 1056
Mr. Knox 1057
Sir J. Haslett 1057
Mr. Lough 1058
First Lord of the Treasury ... 1059

[*May* 21.] Page

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—[NINTH ALLOTTED DAY]:—Considered in Committee 1061

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897–8:—

Class II,—

1. £114,389, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland 1061

Vote agreed to 1102

Class III,—

Motion made, and Question proposed,—

"That a sum, not exceeding £40,229, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for criminal prosecutions and other law charges in Ireland" 1103

Motion withdrawn 1105

Class II,—

2. £1,243, to complete the sum for Charitable Donations and Bequests Office, Ireland—Agreed to 1105

Motion made, and Question proposed,—

"That a sum, not exceeding £3,880, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Public Record Office in Ireland, and of the Keeper of State Papers in Dublin" 1105

Progress reported 1107

WAYS AND MEANS:—Considered in Committee. Resolved, "That it is expedient to amend the law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue." —(*Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1107

Liquor Traffic Local Veto Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1107

Rating of Machinery Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Land Law (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1108

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Agricultural Holdings Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Trawlers' Licensing Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Committee deferred 1108

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill:—Committee deferred 1108

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1108

Page

LORDS: MONDAY, 24TH MAY 1897.

ROYAL NIGER COMPANY :—*(Lord Stanmore)* 1109

Prime Minister ... ... 1111 *Earl of Kimberley* 1113

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Considered in Committee, Reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived 1114

Infant Life Protection Bill [H.L.] :—Read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1114

Volunteers Bill :—

Motion made,

"That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—*(Secretary of State for War)* ... 1114

Lord Monkswell 1115

Read 2ª, and committed 1116

GRIFFITH'S VALUATION :—Personal Explanation—*(Viscount Clifden)* ... 1116

COMMONS: MONDAY, 24TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Liverpool City Churches Bill [H.L.] :—

Motion made and Question, proposed,—

"That the Bill be now Read a Second time" 1117

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—*(Mr. Herbert Roberts)* 1117

Mr. Carvell Williams ... 1120

Mr. W. F. Lawrence ... 1121

Mr. Mellor 1123

President of the Board of Agriculture 1124

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question." The House divided :—Ayes, 205; Noes, 95.—(Division List, No. 213) 1125

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read a Second time 1125

Motion made to refer Bill to a Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House and two by the Committee of Selection.—*(Mr. Roberts)* 1125

The House divided :—Ayes, 117; Noes, 199.—(Division List, No. 214) 1126

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES] :—Committee To-morrow.—*(Home Secretary)* 1126

QUESTIONS.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Harry Foster, and Sir C. Dalrymple; Answers, Under Secretary for War, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and First Commissioner of Works ... 1126

[*May* 24.] *Page*

PRISON SYSTEM (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, Lord Advocate 1127

SCHOOL BOARD DIVISIONS (LONDON)—Question, Mr. Fardell; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1128

TRUCK ACT, 1896—Questions, Sir C. Dilke; Answers, Home Secretary ... 1128

NORTH MUNDHAM SCHOOL BOARD—Questions, Mr. Carvell Williams; Answers, Vice President of the Council [Mr. Speaker] 1129

RIVER FEALE FISHING—Questions, Mr. M. Flavin; Answer, Attorney General 1130

UXBRIDGE UNION—Question, Mr. Bigwood; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 1130

HYDE PARK (FOOTPATHS)—Questions, Captain Norton; Answer, First Commissioner of Works 1131

ARGENTINE CATTLE TRADE—Question, Sir J. Kinloch; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1131

CAVALRY RECRUITS—Question, Mr. Hozier; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1132

MILITIA FIELD OFFICERS—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1132

SECONDARY EDUCATION—Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1133

LEAD POISONING—Question, Mr. McKenna; Answer, Home Secretary ... 1134

FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1134

IRISH SCHOOLS (EPIDEMIC DISEASE)—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1134

CUSTOM HOUSE (LONDON)—Question, Mr. C. Wilson; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury... 1135

NEWBLISS PETTY SESSIONS COURT HOUSE (CO. MONAGHAN)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland... 1135

LIGHT RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1136

DUTY ON HERRINGS—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1136

WORKMISTRESSES (IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1137

LONDONDERRY LUNATIC ASYLUM—Questions, Mr. Knox; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury and Chief Secretary for Ireland 1137

BURIAL (PREMATURE)—Questions, Mr. Macdona; Answers, Home Secretary 1139

ROOSKEY BRIDGE (CO. ROSCOMMON)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 1139

STORNOWAY AND CARLOWAY ROAD—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Lord Advocate 1140

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1141

RURAL POSTMEN (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1141

AGRICULTURAL RATING ACT (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1142

CERTIFICATED TEACHERS (SCOTLAND)—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Lord Advocate 1142

CRETE—Questions, Mr. Lambert; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1142

TURCO-GREEK WAR (ARMISTICE)—Question, Mr. Scott; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1143

CHARGE OF ROBBERY (CO. TYRONE)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 1143

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. P. J. O'Brien, Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 1144

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1145

SHORTHORN BULLS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1146

ADDERGOOLE AND BALLYNAGORAHER DISTRICTS (CASTLEBAR UNION)—Question, Dr. Ambrose; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1146

GLEBE ACT (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1146

SHIRLEY AND TENNISON ESTATES (CO. MONAGHAN)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1147

GRAND JURY ACCOUNTS (CO. MONAGHAN)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1147

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT—Questions, Mr. Lambert; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1148

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Begg; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1148

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS (ROYAL COMMISSION):—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1148

Metropolitan Water Company's Bill:—Motion for leave to introduce—*(President of the Local Government Board)* 1149

Sir J. Pease 1150

Bill presented, and Read the First time.—(267) 1151

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill:—Order for Committee read ... 1151

Notices of Motion 1152

[*Mr. Speaker* ... ... 1153]

Motion made—

"That it be an instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions to secure compensation to workmen for injuries to health arising out of and in the course of their employment.—*(Mr. H. J. Tennant)* ... 1155

Home Secretary 1156
Mr. Haldane 1158
Colonel Blundell 1159
Mr. Burns 1159
Mr. Stuart-Wortley ... 1160
Sir J. Joicey 1160
Mr. Abel Thomas 1161
Mr. Renshaw 1161
Mr. Paulton 1161
Sir E. Hill 1162
Sir C. Dilke 1162

Amendment proposed, after the word "employment," to insert,—

"through the failure of the employer to take reasonable precautions in employments injurious to the health for the mitigation or removal of the risk of injury to the health in such employment."—*(Sir A. Forwood)* ... 1162

Mr. Wyndham 1163
Mr. J. Wilson (Durham, Mid) 1163
Mr. Bartley 1163
Sir J. Pease 1163
Mr. A. Cross 1164
Mr. Asquith 1164
Secretary of State for the Colonies 1168
Mr. Gibson Bowles 1172

[*May 24.*] Page

Amendment withdrawn 1172

Mr. Kearley ... ... 1172 *Mr. McKenna*... 1173
Mr. Muntz ... .. 1173 *Colonel Denny* 1173

Question proposed, "That those words be added." Amendment withdrawn. Main Question put. The House divided :—Ayes, 144; Noes, 233.—(Division List, No. 215) 1174

Bill considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—(Liability of certain employers to workmen for injuries) ... 1174

Motion to report Progress.—*(Mr. Tomlinson)*—Chairman declined to propose such Question 1175

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1) to leave out the words "to which this Act applies," and to insert the words "in which a workman (as hereinafter defined) is engaged."—*(Mr. Nussey)* ... 1175

Question put, "That the words 'to which this Act applies,' stand part of the clause."—The Committee divided: Ayes, 233; Noes, 155.—(Division List, No. 216) 1208

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1) to leave out the words "arising out of and."—*(Mr. McKenna)* 1208

Amendment negatived 1209

Amendment proposed, at the end of Sub-section (1), after the word "Act," to insert the words—

"notwithstanding the fact that any such workman may be at the same time in receipt of any benefit from any registered friendly society."—*(Mr. Galloway)*—Negatived 1209

Amendment proposed, to insert certain words at the end of Sub-section (1).—*(Mr. Walton)*—Agreed to 1209

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "Act," to insert certain words.—*(Colonel Denny)*—Withdrawn 1210

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (2), after the word "that," to insert—

"(*a*) The employer shall not be liable under this Act to pay compensation to any workman by whose wilful and wrongful act or default the accident arises in respect of which compensation for injury may become payable."—*(Mr. Seton-Karr)* 1211

Motion made, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—*(Mr. Chamberlain)* 1211

Question put and agreed to. Committee report Progress 1212

Berriew School Bill :—Motion made—"That the Bill be now Read the Third time." Debate adjourned 1212

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill :—Third Reading deferred 1212

SUPPLY [21st MAY]—Resolutions reported :—

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1897-8.—

Class II,—

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £[illegible], be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland, including certain grants in aid of Local Taxation" 1212

[*May* 24.] *Page*

2. *"That a sum, not exceeding £1,243, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland"* 1212

Resolution agreed to 1212

Poor Law Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1213

Post Office (Sites) Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1213

Dangerous Performances Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1213

Post Office Consolidation Bill [*H.L.*] :—*Committee deferred* 1213

Agricultural and Industries (Ireland) Bill :—*Order for Second Reading read and discharged; Bill withdrawn* 1213

Law of Evidence (Criminal Cases) Bill :—*Committee deferred* 1213

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill :—*Order for Second Reading read and discharged; Bill withdrawn* 1213

Finance Bill :—*Considered in Committee; Progress reported* 1213

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill :—*Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May], further adjourned* 1213

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [*H.L.*] :—*Second Reading deferred* .. 1213

School Boards' Expenses Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1213

Land Transfer Bill [*H.L.*] :—*Second Reading deferred* 1213

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—*Committee deferred* 1213

Public Offices (Whitehall) Site (Re-committed) Bill :—*Committee deferred* ... 1213

Patent Office Extension (Re committed) Bill :—*Committee deferred* 1214

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1214

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill :—*Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned* 1214

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill :—*Second Reading deferred* 1214

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill :—*Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned* 1214

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 1214

WAYS AND MEANS—[21st May] :—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue." Resolution agreed to 1214

Ordered, that it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Finance Bill that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—*(Chancellor of the Exchequer)* 1214

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 1214

Solicitors' (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1214

Married Persons' Small Industrial Incomes (Tax Relief) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1214

Boiler Inspection and Registration Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1214

[*May* 24.] *Page*

Local Authorities (Scotland) Loans Bill :—Order for Second Reading read and discharged; Bill withdrawn 1214

Polling Arrangements (London) Bill :—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 1215

Shop Assistants (Half-Holiday) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill :—Committee deferred 1215

District Councils (Water Supply Facilities) Bill—Second Reading deferred ... 1215

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Coroners' Inquests (Railway Fatalities) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1215

Registration of Firms Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Tithe Redemption Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Married Women (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1215

Election Petitions Bill :—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 1215

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Wednesday 1215

Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Bill :—Third Reading deferred ... 1215

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1216

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 1216

Colonial Solicitors Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1216

Land Law (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1216

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1216

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1216

Vehicles (Lights) Bill :—Committee deferred 1216

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill :—Committee deferred 1216

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1216

MOTIONS.

Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill :—To amend the Licensing (Scotland) Acts 1828 to 1887; presented, and Read the First time.—(268) 1216

Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration Bill :—To amend the Law relating to Registration of Parliamentary Voters in Ireland; presented, and Read the First time.—(269) 1216

LORDS : TUESDAY, 25TH MAY 1897.

Juries Detention Bill :—Reported from the Standing Committee with Amendments.—[No. 98] 1217

Excise Licences Bill [H.L.] :—Bill to consolidate the enactments granting and relating to the duties payable upon excise licences; presented by Viscount Peel, and Read 1ª.—[No. 99] 1217

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill :—Motion made "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—(*Lord President of the Council*) 1217

Lord Playfair 1223
Earl of Cranbrook ... 1225
Lord Reay 1226
Lord Norton 1229
Earl of Kimberley 1231

Bill Read a Second time, and committed 1234

Industries (Ireland) Bill :—Motion made, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time." (*Earl of Mayo*) 1234

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Motion to add the words "this day six months."—(*Earl of Arran*) 1235

Earl of Denbigh... ... 1235
Earl of Morley 1236
Earl of Wemyss 1239
Prime Minister 1239
Earl of Mayo 1240

Amendment withdrawn; original Motion and Bill withdrawn 1240

Mersey Channels Bill :—Read 2ª, and Committed 1241

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill :—Bill Read a Third time and passed 1241

LAND LEGISLATION (IRELAND) :—Motion made,—

"(1) That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when, in the interests of justice, some compensation should be granted to landowners for the rights of which they have been deprived by the State; (2) that some relief might equitably be afforded to landowners, by granting State loans, on the same terms as those given to land occupiers, to facilitate the purchase by the landlord of the tenant-right or goodwill of the occupier, where he is willing to sell such interest, or for any other purposes sanctioned by Parliament."—(*Lord Inchiquin*) 1241

Debate adjourned till Friday next... 1251

COMMONS : TUESDAY, 25TH MAY 1897.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1894 (PAROCHIAL CHARITIES) :—(*Mr. Strachey*) ... 1251

[*May* 25.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

Black Watch Regiment (Subathu)—Question, Colonel Wyndham Murray; Answer, Secretary of State for India 1251
Post Office Savings Bank—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury... 1252
Post Office Guide—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1253
Parish Councils Association—Questions, Mr. Hermon-Hodge; Answers, Secretary to the Local Government Board 1253
Battalions Abroad—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1254
Colliery Accident (Polesworth)—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, Home Secretary 1255
Trawling (Moray Firth)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1256
Queensland—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Under Secretary for the Colonies 1256
Salmon Fishery (Cashen River)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1256
Foreigners as British Pilots—Question, Mr. Willox; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1257
Tokat Massacre—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1257
Army Reserve—Questions, Captain Grice-Hutchinson; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1258
Industrial Schools—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1258
Post Office Prosecution—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1259
Militia Officers—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1259
Cape Garrison—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Under Secretary for War 1260
Science Teachers—Question, Mr. W. Field; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1260
Franchise Acts, 1885—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1261
Colonisation Board (Manitoba)—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. Anstruther 1261
Queen's Diamond Jubilee—Questions, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Causton, and Mr. W. Johnston; Answers, Home Secretary, First Commissioner of Works, and First Lord of the Treasury 1261
Edinburgh University—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1263
Postal Telegraph Office—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1264
Light Railways (Ireland)—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1264
Land Law (Ireland) Act 1887—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1265
Land Commission—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1265
Irish Mail Service—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1265

[May 25.] *Page*

Factory and Workshops Act, 1895 (Dock and Wharf Machinery)—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Home Secretary 1266
Reading Prison (Discharge of Warder)—Question, Mr. Davitt; Answer, Home Secretary 1266
Local Government Electors—Question, Sir H. Fowler; Answer, Home Secretary 1267
Religious Orders (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1267
Canadian Fast Atlantic Service—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 1267
Dingley Tariff Bill (United States)—Question, Major Jameson; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1268
Charge of Larceny (Co. Tyrone)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 1269
Police Pensioners—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1269
Crete—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1270
Army Remounts—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1270
Voters List (Westmeath)—Question, Mr. D. Sullivan; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland... 1270
Lewis—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1271
Indian Budget—Question, Mr. S. Smith; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1271
Business of the House—Questions, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Henniker Heaton, and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury ... 1272

British South Africa Committee:—Question of Privilege 1272
Mr. J. Lowther ... ... 1272 *Mr. Speaker* 1273

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill:—Considered in Committee. [Progress 24th May] 1273

Clause 1,—(Liability of certain Employers to Workmen for injuries) ... 1273

Another Amendment proposed [24th May], in Sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words,—

"(*a*) the employer shall not be liable under this Act, to pay compensation to any workman by whose wilful and wrongful act or default the accident arises in respect of which compensation for injury may become payable."—*(Mr. Seton-Karr)* 1274

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—Debate resumed 1274

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, to leave out all the words after the word "liable" and insert the following words,—

"to pay compensation in respect of any injury sustained by any workman which arises from the wilful disregard, by such workman, of any rule or regulation, contained in, or established under any Act of Parliament, which it is the duty of such workman to observe, or from the drunkenness, or gross misconduct of such workman."—*(Attorney General)* 1287

[*May* 25.] Page

Further Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, to leave out the words,—

"wilful disregard by such workman of any rule or regulation, contained in, or established under any Act of Parliament, which was the duty of such workman to observe."—*(Sir C. Dilke)* 1296

Question proposed, "That the words down to 'observe,' inclusive, stand part of the Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended."—Amendment proposed to the Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn 1300

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn.—Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn 1300

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words :—

"a claim is lodged with the employer or his representative within three months after the accident causing the injury."—*(Mr. J. Wilson,* Falkirk Burghs*)* ... 1300

Amendment withdrawn 1305

Amendment proposed to insert the following words :—

"Notice of any accident to a workman shall be given by or on behalf of the workman to the employer or his agent as soon as possible, and in no case later than three months after the happening thereof."—*(Mr. Harrison)* 1305

Amendment withdrawn 1314

Amendment proposed to leave out paragraph (*a*) Sub-section (2).—*(Mr. J. Wilson,* Durham*)* 1314

Amendment withdrawn 1318

Amendment proposed in paragraph (*a*) sub-section (2), to leave out the word "two," and insert the word "four," the effect of the Amendment being to relieve the employer of liability in respect of any injury "which does not disable the workman for a period of at least four weeks from earning full wages."—*(Mr. Hardy)* 1318

Amendment negatived 1327

Amendment proposed in paragraph (*a*) Sub-section (2), after the word "weeks," to insert the words "immediately subsequent to the injury"—*(Mr. Renshaw)*—Withdrawn 1327

Amendment proposed in Sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words,—

"he shall not be so liable if he shall be a member of a trade association in the management of which employers and workmen shall have equal representation, and shall have contributed to the funds of such association an amount not less than the amount contributed by his workman to such funds."—*(Mr. Bousfield)* 1327

Amendment negatived 1329

Amendment proposed, in paragraph (*b*), Sub-section (1), to leave out the words :—

"When it is decided, as hereinafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible"—*(Mr. Haldane)* 1329

Progress reported 1342

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES] :—Committee thereupon deferred 1342

Labour Bureaux Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1342

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Ireland) Bill :— Second Reading deferred 1342

[*May* 26.] *Page*

Parish Registers Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Registration of Parliamentary Voters Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1343

Church Patronage Transfer Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Shops (Early Closing) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Trout Fishing Close Time (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Sale of Distress Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill :—Committee deferred 1343

Trawlers' Licensing Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1343

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [H.L.] :—Second Reading deferred ... 1343

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

Shop Assistants (Half Holiday) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Bill :—Read the Third time, and passed 1344

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill : Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 1344

Land Law (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1344

COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 26TH MAY 1897.

COMMITTEES (ASCENSION DAY) :—Motion made, "That Committees do not meet to-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the clock"—*(First Lord of the Treasury)* 1345

After brief Debate, the House divided :—Ayes, 162; Noes, 51.—(Division List, No. 217) 1345

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill :—Considered in Committee. [Progress 25th May]

Clause 1,—(Liability of certain Employers to Workmen for Injuries) ... 1346

Amendment proposed, to leave out Sub-Section (*b*), and to insert,—

"When it is decided, as hereinafter provided, that injury caused by the personal negligence or the wilful act of the employer or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any civil liability of the employer, but in that case the amount of damages due from such employer may, at the request of the person claiming compensation,

[*May* 26.] *Page*

be settled by arbitration in accordance with the second schedule of this Act, or may, at the option of such person, be recovered from such employer by the same proceedings as were open to such person before the commencement of this Act. But the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default"—*(Home Secretary)* 1348

Amendment agreed to 1363

Amendment proposed, in paragraph (*b*), Sub-section (2) to omit the words "wilful and wrongful act or default," and to insert instead thereof the words "personal negligence or wilful act"—*(Home Secretary)*—Agreed to 1363

Amendment proposed, to insert the following new Sub-section (*c*):—

"If it is proved that the accident is solely attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of the workman himself any compensation claimed in respect of injuries to such workman shall be disallowed"—*(Secretary of State for the Colonies)* 1364

Question put, "That those words be there inserted." The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 123.—(Division List—No. 218—appended) 1374

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (3) to leave out the words "wilful or wrongful act or default" and to insert "personal negligence or wilful act," the Amendment being consequential upon what had been previously decided by the Committee—*(Home Secretary)*—Agreed to 1378

Amendment proposed, to insert in Sub-section (3) after the words "injured," the following words,—

"or whether the accident was solely attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of the workman in respect of whose injuries compensation is claimed"—*(Attorney General)*—Agreed to 1378

Amendment proposed, after the words last added, to insert the words,

"or whether loss or damage has resulted to the dependants from the death of the workman."—*(Mr. Renshaw)* 1378

Amendment withdrawn 1382

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (3) after the word "agreement" to insert the words "and any question as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies shall"—*(Mr. McKenna)* 1382

Amendment agreed to 1383

Amendment proposed, new sub-section—*(Mr. J. Wilson)* 1383

Progress reported 1393

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES]:—Committee thereupon deferred 1393

Benefices Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 1394

Education Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Benefices (No. 2) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Cotton Cloth and other Factories Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Prison-Made Goods (Importation) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Aliens Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Working Men's Dwellings Bill [H.L.]:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Militia Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

Justices of the Peace Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1394

[*May* 27.] Page

Local Government (County Council Clerks) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1394

Ground Game Act (Extension to Copyholders) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Jurors' Expenses Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Cemeteries Rating Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Commons Regulation Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Rivers Pollution Prevention Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Police Pensions and Service Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

Smaller Dwellings (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1395

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 1395

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 1395

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 1395

Labour Bureaux Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

Parish Registers Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

Land Law (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

County Government (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1396

MONEY LENDING :—Ordered, That Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. A. K. Loyd be added to the Select Committee on Money Lending—*(Sir William Walrond)* 1396

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill :—Bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act 1880; presented and Read the First time.—(270) 1396

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 27TH MAY 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Railway Clearing House Bill [H.L.] :—Motion made,—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they insert provisions requiring the promoters to publish for the use of traders, on such terms and conditions as the Board of Trade may direct, any sectional or other railway maps constructed for the Railway Clearing House, indicating the different lines of railway and the distances along the same."—*(Mr. Tomlinson)* 1397

Mr. Channing 1399
Mr. Maclure 1400
Mr. Mellor 1401
Mr. Murdoch 1402
Mr. Bryce 1402
Mr. Tomlinson 1403
Mr. Perks 1403
[*Mr. Speaker* ... ... 1403]
Mr. Lough 1403
President of the Board of Trade 1400, 1403
Sir J. Pease 1400, 1403

Debate adjourned 1404

Succession (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1404

QUESTIONS.

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY (SCOTLAND)—Question, Sir T. Sutherland; Answer, Lord Advocate 1404
POSTAL FACILITIES (CO. CAVAN)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1404
NATIONAL SCHOOL MONITORS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1405
TUSKAR LIGHT—Question, Mr. Drage; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1405
DISCHARGE OF BRITISH SEAMEN ABROAD—Question, Sir G. Baden-Powell; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1406
EQUIVALENT GRANT (SCOTLAND)—Question, Sir Lewis McIver; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1406
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES—Questions, Mr. Lough; Answers, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1407
BALLINAMORE CANAL—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1407
ARMY SERVICE RECORD (JOSH. DENISTON)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1408
LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1408
CYCLES (CARRIAGE BY RAIL)—Question, Mr. J. Boyce; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1409
LONGFORD UNION WORKHOUSE—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1409
ANTIQUITIES (IRELAND)—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1410
CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (LONDON)—Questions, Captain Donelan; Answers, Home Secretary 1410
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Sir J. Leng, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Field, and Captain Norton; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury, Home Secretary, and Financial Secretary to the War Office [Mr. Speaker]... ... 1411
MARYBOROUGH GAOL (PRISONER THOMAS COLLINS)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1413
IRISH FISHERIES—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Field; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1413
POLICE FORCE (CO. KERRY)—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland [Mr. Speaker] 1414
PORTUMNA RAILWAY—Questions, Mr. Field and Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1415
SCHOOL ATTENDANCES (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1415
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AUDITORS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1416
LIGHTHOUSES (RED SEA)—Question, Mr. Wm. Redmond; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1416
CAVALRY RECRUITING STANDARD—Question, General Russell; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1417
KING'S LYNN PILOT COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. Willox; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1417
PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS)—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Lord Advocate 1418
FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1418

[*May* 27.] *Page*

ARTILLERY PRACTICE (PLYMOUTH SOUND)—Question, Mr. Mildmay; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 1419
NEWINGTON VESTRY ELECTION—Question, Mr. Bailey; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 1419
READING PRISON (DISCHARGE OF WARDER)—Question Mr. Davitt; Answer, Home Secretary 1420
BROADMOOR CRIMINAL LUNATIC ASYLUM (ISABELLA HEWSON)—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Home Secretary 1421
INDIAN STAFF CORPS—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Secretary of State for India 1421
CHARGE OF LARCENY (CO. TYRONE)—Questions, Mr. Daly, Mr. Wm. Johnston, and Mr. Dillon; Answers, Attorney General for Ireland 1422
MERSEY DOCKS BILL—Questions, Mr. Daley and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1423
GLEBE ACT (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1423
VOTERS' LISTS (CO. WESTMEATH)—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Attorney General for Ireland 1424
MULLINGAR UNION—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1424
RIVER NETHY (INVERNESS-SHIRE)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1425
TELEGRAPH EXTENSIONS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1425
SALLEEN PIER (CO. KERRY)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1426
VACCINATION (LYMPH SUPPLY)—Question, Sir Wm. Priestley; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 1426
CASTLEBLANEY PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1427
JHALAWAR—Questions, Mr. W. Jones and Mr. Parker Smith; Answers, Secretary of State for India 1427
ARMY STAFF APPOINTMENTS (INDIA)—Question, Captain Pirie; Answer, Secretary of State for India 1428
FINANCE ACT (NEW SOUTH WALES)—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1429
UGANDA RAILWAY—Question, Mr. Perks; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1430
POSTAL DELIVERIES (CIRCULARS)—Question, Mr. Bhownaggree; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1430
TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) BILL—Question, Mr. Younger; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1430
SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1431
DRAINAGE WORKS (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Tully and Mr. Doogan; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1431
WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL—Questions, Mr. Seton-Karr; Answer, Attorney General 1432

MOTION.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill:—To legalise the use of Weights and Measures of the Metric System; presented, and Read the First time—(271) 1432

[*May* 27.] Page

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES] :—Considered in Committee. After short Debate, Resolved :—

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expenses of and relating to arbitration which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to amend the law with respect to compensation to workmen for accidental injuries suffered in the course of their employment, and of any compensation that may become payable in respect of accidents to workmen employed by or under the Crown in pursuance of such Act."—*(Home Secretary)* 1433

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill :—Considered in Committee.—[Progress, 26th May].

Clause 1,—(Liability of Certain Employers to Workmen for Injuries) ... 1434

Another Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (3) to insert as a new sub-section the words :—

"(4) Proceedings for the recovery under this Act of compensation for an injury shall not be maintainable unless notice *that injury has been* sustained is given within six weeks, and an arbitration is commenced within six months from the occurrence of the accident causing the injury, or, in case of death, within twelve months from the time of death. Provided always that in the case of death the want of such notice shall be no bar to the maintenance of such proceedings if the arbitrator shall be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse for such want of notice. The notice shall be served in the manner provided by the Employers' Liability Act 1880, Section 7."—*(Mr. John Wilson,* Falkirk Burghs).

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, in line 2, to leave out from the word "notice," to the word "within," in line 4, in order to insert the words "of the claim is given."—*(Mr. Chamberlain)* 1435

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment" 1435

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."—Debate resumed 1435

Amendment to the proposed Amendment withdrawn.—Amendment, by leave, withdrawn 1442

Amendment proposed, to leave out Sub-section (4), in order to insert the words :—

"Any agreement made between an employer and workman for the purpose of contracting themselves out of this Act shall be void."—*(Mr. Ascroft)* ... 1442

Question put, "That the words 'If the Registrar of Friendly Societies' stand part of the Clause. The Committee divided :—Ayes, 170 ; Noes, 97.—(Division List, No. 219) 1462

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4) after the word "societies," to insert the words "after ascertaining the views of the employers and workmen or either of their representatives."—*(Mr. Ascroft)* ... 1462

Amendment, as amended by the omission of the words "or either of their representatives," agreed to 1462

Amendment proposed in Sub-section (4) after the word "certifies," to insert the words "with the approval of the Secretary of State."—*(Mr. J. A. Pease)* 1462

Amendment withdrawn 1463

[*May* 27.] *Page*

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4), after the word "insurance," to insert the words "whether mutual or otherwise."—*(Colonel Denny)*... 1464

Amendment (Mr. Strachey) ruled out of order 1464

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4), after the words "employment is," to insert the words "so far as regards the contributions of the employer in particular, and"—*(Sir C. Dilke)* 1464

Amendment withdrawn 1465

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4), to leave out the words "on the whole not less favourable," and to insert the words "more beneficial."—*(Mr. Perks)* 1465

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause." The Committee divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 64.—(Division List, No. 220) 1465

Amendment proposed, providing that if the Registrar of Friendly Societies certified that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment was on the whole not less favourable to the workmen "and others deriving right through them" than the provisions of the Bill, the employer might contract with any of the workmen that the provisions of the scheme should be substituted for the provisions of the Bill.—*(Mr. J. Wilson,* Falkirk Burghs) 1465

Amendment withdrawn 1466

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4) after the words "favourable to the workmen," to insert the words, "and their dependants"—*(Attorney General)*—Agreed to 1466

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4) after the words "provisions of this Act," to insert the words,—

"and also certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workman in any employment does not contain an obligation upon the workman to join any such scheme."—*(Mr. Galloway.)*—Withdrawn.

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4), to insert the words:—

"No such scheme shall be so certified which contains an obligation upon the workmen to join the scheme as a condition of their hiring."—*(Attorney General)* —Agreed to 1466

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (4), after the word "Act," to insert the words, "and certifies that the financial position of such a scheme is satisfactory"—*(Mr. J. A. Pease)*—Withdrawn ... 1467

Amendment proposed, after the words "contrary made," to insert the words "before or"—*(Mr. Galloway)*—Withdrawn 1468

Amendment proposed, to add the following new Sub-section to Clause 1:—

(5.) Where the injury is caused by the wilful and wrongful act of any person in the service of the workman's employer, the employer shall be as responsible for such act or default as if the workman had not been a workman of nor in in the service of the employer nor engaged in his work.—*(Mr. McKenna)* ... 1468

Question put, "That those words be there added."—The Committee divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 165.—(Division List, No. 221.) ... 1470

Amendment proposed, to insert after the words last added the following words:—

"No scheme shall be so certified which contains an obligation upon the workmen to join the scheme as a condition of their hiring"—*(Attorney General)*— Agreed to... 1471

[*May* 27.] *Page*

Amendment proposed, to insert at the end of the clause the following words :—

"or which has not been approved by three-fourths of the workmen ascertained by ballot vote."—*(Mr. Pickard)* 1471

Question put, "That those words be there added." The Committee divided :—Ayes, 110; Noes, 189.—(Division List, No. 222.) ... 1474

Amendment proposed, after the words last inserted, to add the following words :—

"and no scheme shall be so certified by the Registrar of Friendly Societies unless he is satisfied as to its financial position as ascertained by actuarial examination"—*(Mr. J. A. Pease)*—Withdrawn 1474

Amendment proposed, to insert after the words last added, the following words :—

"(*b*) Any such scheme shall be deemed to be less favourable to the workmen unless it provides that the contributions to be made by the employer under the scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in his employment shall be sufficient to secure the full amount and duration of the compensation payable under this Act"—*(Mr. Holland)*—Withdrawn 1476

Amendment proposed, to insert after the words last added, the following words :—

"If the contributions of the employer, as fixed by the scheme, shall prove in any event to be insufficient to meet any claim or claims to the full compensation payable under this Act, the deficiency may be recoverable from the employer under the provisions of this Act"—*(Mr. Holland)*—Withdrawn 1477

Amendment proposed, after the words inserted, to add the words :—

"The Registrar of Friendly Societies shall in every year make a report of his proceedings under this Act, and that report shall be laid before Parliament"—*(Home Secretary)*—Agreed to 1483

Amendment proposed, after the words last inserted, to add the following words :—

"It shall be lawful for the employer at any time to substitute for his liability under this Act the engagement or guarantee of any insurance corporation or association previously approved by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and on such Secretary of State certifying that he is satisfied as to the sufficiency of the engagement or guarantee of such corporation or association, and that it has undertaken the liability of the employer, any liability of the employer under this Act so undertaken shall thereupon cease"—(*Sir J. Joicey*)—Withdrawn 1483

Committee report Progress... 1485

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—Committee deferred 1485

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill :—Third Reading deferred 1485

Berriew School Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Third Reading [24th May] further adjourned 1485

Prisons Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1485

Police (Property) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1485

Poor Law Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1486

Post Office (Sites) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1486

Finance Bill :—Committee deferred 1486

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned 1486

School Boards' Expenses Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1486

[*May* 27.] *Page*

Biçycles (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1486

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 1486

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 1486

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [H.L.]:—Second Reading deferred ... 1486

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1486

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1486

Poor Law Franchise (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 1486

County Secretaries Superannuation (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1486

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred... 1487

Bakehouses Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Locomotives on Highways Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Borough Funds Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Canals Protection (London) Bill:—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 1487

Cottage Homes Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Midwives' Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 1487

District Councils (Water Supply Facilities) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1487

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1487

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Committee deferred 1487

Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1487

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill:—Committee deferred 1488

Archdeaconry of London (Additional Endowments) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 1488

Cotton Cloth and other Factories Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Labour Bureaux Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Parish Registers Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Land Law (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1488

MOTION.

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill:—To amend the Employers' Liability Act of 1880; presented and Read the First time.—(272) ... 1488

LORDS: FRIDAY, 28TH MAY 1897.

Excise Licences Bill [H.L.]:—Second Reading put off 1489

FINANCE ACTS (WORKS OF ART):—Motion made:—

"That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should take such steps to amend the Finance Acts of 1894 and 1896 as may be necessary to preserve in the country 'such pictures, prints, books, MSS., works of art, and scientific collections, not yielding income, as are of national, scientific, or historic interest.'"—*(Earl Stanhope)* 1489

Earl of Leven and Melville 1493
Lord Leconfield 1494
Lord Kelvin 1495
Earl of Crawford 1496
Lord Stanley of Alderley ... 1498
Lord Privy Seal 1499

Motion submitted in amended form 1501

Earl Stanhope 1501
Lord Privy Seal ... 1501
Viscount Clifden 1501

Resolved in the negative 1501

Church Patronage Transfer Bill [H.L.]:—Considered in Committee; Reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1501

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT:—Questions, Earl of Camperdown; Answers, Lord Privy Seal 1502

Juries Detention Bill:—

Question proposed "That the Report of Amendment to this Bill be received" 1503

Clause 3,—(Extent of Act) 1503

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "or Ireland."—(*Lord Coleridge*) 1503

Amendment withdrawn 1503

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—Considered in Committee; Reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived ... 1504

Mersey Channels Bill:—Considered in Committee; Reported without Amendment; and re-committed 1504

LAND LEGISLATION (IRELAND):—Order of the Day read for resuming the Debate on the Motion to resolve—

1st. That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when, in the interests of justice some compensation should be granted to landowners for the rights of which they have been deprived by the State; 2ndly. That some relief might equitably be afforded to landowners by granting State loans on same terms as those given to land occupiers, to facilitate the purchase by the landlord of the tenant-right or goodwill of the occupier where he is willing to sell such interest, or for any other purpeses sanctioned by Parliament 1504

Resolved "That the Debate be further adjourned until after the Whitsun Recess."—(*Lord Clonbrock*) 1505

Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Bill:—Read 1ª.—(No. 101) ... 1505

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 28TH MAY 1897.

Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1505

QUESTIONS.

ALIEN IMMIGRATION—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1505

CLEANING MACHINERY IN MOTION—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Home Secretary 1506

ANNALY ESTATE (CO. LONGFORD)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1507

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Aird, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Holburn, Sir J. Leng, Sir Barrington Simeon, and Mr. Daly; Answers, First Commissioner of Works, Secretary to the Treasury, First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Anstruther, Secretary of State for the Colonies, Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Financial Secretary to the War Office ... 1507

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS—Question, Mr. Nicol; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1510

STATIONERY OFFICE—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1510

AMERICAN CATTLE—Questions, Mr. Macaleese and Mr. Wolff; Answers, President of the Board of Agriculture 1511

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1512

POTATO CROP (LISTOWEL DISTRICT)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1512

CIVIL SERVICE (TEMPORARY MEN COPYISTS)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1513

IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1513

ROYAL CANAL HARBOUR, LONGFORD—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 1514

IRISH CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS—Question, Mr. Serjeant Hemphill; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1514

POSTAL ORDERS—Question, Mr. Hudson; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1515

ZANZIBAR—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1516

FUGITIVE SLAVES (BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE)—Questions, Sir J. Kennaway and Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1516

DISTRESS RELIEF WORKS (CO. CAVAN)—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1517

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Jasper Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1518

MULLINGAR UNION—Question, Mr. Jasper Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1518

IRISH ANTIQUITIES—Question, Mr. Lecky; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1519

GAMBLING IN PRODUCE FUTURES—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1519

[*May* 28.] *Page*

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, DUBLIN—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1520

DELAGOA BAY ARBITRATION AWARD—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1520

MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY (GREENWICH)—Question, Lord Hugh Cecil; Answer, First Commissioner of Works 1520

ARMY REGULATIONS (ST. PATRICK'S DAY)—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1521

NAVAL MANŒUVRES—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 1521

RURAL POST MESSENGER (DISMISSAL)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1521

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—Questions, Lord Warkworth, Mr. Skewes-Cox, and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1522

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Carvell-Williams, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Channing, Colonel Milward, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. J. P. Farrell, and Mr. Clancy; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1523

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—[TENTH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee :—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

Class I. :—

1. £132,291, to complete the sum for Survey of the United Kingdom... 1525

Vote agreed to 1537

2. Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £24,037 (including an additional sum of £11,950), be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for maintaining certain harbours, lighthouses, etc., under the Board of Trade" 1537

Suspension of Mr. John Redmond 1540

Mr. W. Redmond ordered to withdraw 1545

Mr. W. Field ordered to withdraw 1546

Vote agreed to 1546

3. Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for constructing a new Harbour of Refuge at Peterhead." 1547

Amendment proposed, "That Item B (Salaries) be reduced by £300, in respect of the salary of the Chief Engineer."—(*Mr. Weir.*)—Withdrawn 1556

Original Question put. The Committee divided:—Ayes, 147; Noes, 32. —(Division List, No. 225) 1557

4. £189,367, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property 1557

Vote agreed to 1561

[May 28.] *Page*

CLASS II. :—

5. £19,576, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices.—Agreed to 1561

6. Motion made, and Question proposed,—

"That a sum, not exceeding £132,859, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments" 1561

Amendment proposed, to reduce the Vote by £1,000.—*(Mr. Weir)* ... 1564

Amendment withdrawn 1575

Original Question put, and agreed to 1575

7. Motion made, and Question proposed,—

"That a sum, not exceeding £29,215, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for a grant in aid of the Mercantile Marine Fund" 1575

Amendment proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £25,000 be granted for the said Service."—*(Captain Pirie)* 1576

Amendment withdrawn.—Original Question put, and agreed to ... 1577

8. £8, to complete the sum for Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade.—Agreed to 1577

9. £34,291, to complete the sum for Board of Agriculture 1577

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next 1590

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES] :—Resolution reported, and agreed to 1591

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 1591

Land Tenure Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1591

Tenant Right in Towns (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1591

Land Law (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1591

London Water Companies Amalgamation Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1591

Boards of Guardians and Labourers (Ireland) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading [7th April] further adjourned 1591

Sale of Food and Drugs Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1591

County Councils (Qualification of Women) Bill :—Second Reading deferred... 1591

Verminous Persons Bill :—Considered in Committee, and reported 1591

Sale of Distress Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1592

Trawlers' Licensing Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1592

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1592

Poor Law Franchise (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1592

Locomotives on Highways Bill :—Read a Second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. 1592

Parish Registers Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1592

[*May* 31.] *Page*

Land Law (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1592

County Government (Ireland) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1592

WHITSUNTIDE HOLIDAYS:—On the Motion "That the House do now adjourn"—Statement by the First Lord of the Treasury 1592

LORDS: MONDAY, 31ST MAY 1897.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION:—

Lord Clonbrock ... ... 1593 *Viscount Clifden* 1593

Floods Prevention Bill [H.L.]:—Bill to give further powers to County Councils, with a view to the prevention of floods and other damage arising from rivers or watercourses; presented by Lord Thring, and Read 1ª.—(No. 102) 1594

Copyright Amendment Bill [H.L.]:—

Motion made:—

"That the Bill be now Read a Second time.—*(Lord Monkswell)* 1594

Secretary to the Board of Trade 1598
Lord Thring 1599
Lord Herschell 1599
Lord Chancellor 1601

Bill Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee 1602

Juries Detention Bill:—Read 2ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, passed, and returned to the Commons 1602

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill:—Read 3ª, and passed ... 1602

Volunteers Bill:—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read, and discharged 1602

WHITSUNTIDE RECESS:—Question, Earl of Kimberley; Answer, Prime Minister 1602

COMMONS: MONDAY, 31ST MAY 1897.

Coal Mines Regulation Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1602

QUESTIONS.

COVENT GARDEN THEATRE FUND—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Attorney General 1603

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Dillon, Captain Donelan, and Mr. Gilhooly; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1603

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1604

[*May* 31.]

Page

TELEPHONE SYSTEM (PETERBOROUGH)—Question, Mr. Purvis; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1605
CIVIL SERVICE (CLERKS)—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Lord Advocate 1605
HERRING BRAND FEES—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Lord Advocate 1606
BOARD OF REVENUE (MADRAS) — Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Secretary of State for India 1606
ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY—Question, Mr. Brookfield; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1607
LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN AFRICA—Question, Sir C. Dilke; Answer, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1608
SCOTTISH FISHERIES BOARD—Questions, Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Weir; Answers, Lord Advocate 1608
POST OFFICE (ADULT MESSENGERS)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1609
ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE (STORNOWAY)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 1609
ARTISANS' DWELLINGS (LONDON)—Question, Mr. Robertson; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1610
SWANSEA GRAMMAR SCHOOL—Question, Sir J. Dillwyn-Llewelyn; Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 1611
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (JUNIOR EXAMINERS)—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1612
NAVY (PERSONNEL)—Question, Mr. Flower; Answer, First Lord of the Admiralty 1613
LITTLEDALE ESTATE (CO. WICKLOW)—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1613
SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—Questions, Sir Francis Powell and Mr. Whitmore; Answer, First Commissioner of Works 1614
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—Questions, Mr. Parker Smith, Captain Norton, and Mr. Bartley; Answers, First Commissioner of Works, First Lord of the Admiralty, Secretary of State for India, Lord Stanley, and Under Secretary for War 1615
JURORS CHALLENGED (CO. TYRONE)—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland... 1616
MURDER OF YUSAF YUNAN—Questions, Mr. Stevenson; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1617
PARISH COUNCILLORS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1618
INSPECTORS OF POOR (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1618
CANADIAN MAIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 1619
ARMY STAFF OFFICERS (INDIA)—Questions, Colonel Wyndham Murray and Captain Pirie; Answers, Secretary of State for India 1619
MILITARY PRISONS—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. J. A. Pease, and Mr. Holland; Answers, Under Secretary for War 1620
BERRIEW SCHOOL SCHEME—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen; Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 1621
FERMANAGH SCHOOL ESTATE—Question, Mr. Doogan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1622
LLANBEDR SCHOOL BOARD—Questions, Lord Hugh Cecil; Answers, Vice President of the Council 1622
LABOURER'S COTTAGE (STRABANE)—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1623

[*May* 31.]

Page
LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY COMPANY—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1624
RAILWAY DRAWINGS AND RELICS—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, President of the Board of Trade 1624
PNEUMATIC MESSAGES—Questions, Sir Lewis McIver; Answers, Secretary to the Treasury 1624
IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1625
ARMY FOOD AND FORAGE SUPPLIES—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Captain Donelan; Answers, Financial Secretary to the War Office ... 1625
MASHONALAND—Questions, Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster and Mr. J. Morley; Answers, Secretary of State for the Colonies 1626
INDIAN POLICE—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Secretary of State for India 1627
WESTMEATH (APPOINTMENT OF SHERIFF)—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1628
GRANARD UNION—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1628
SNEEM PIER (CO. KERRY)—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1629
PETTY SESSIONS FEES (CO. LIMERICK)—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1629
GUN AND GAME LICENCES (IRELAND)—Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1630
POST OFFICE OVERTIME—Question, Mr. Lough; Answer, Secretary to the Treasury 1630
CATTLE FOOD (IMPORTED)—Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, President of the Local Government Board 1631
BRITISH ZUKON CHARTERED COMPANY—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Secretary of State for the Colonies 1631
FINANCE BILL—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1631
CRIMEAN VETERAN (JOHN BRENNAN)—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Financial Secretary to the War Office 1632
FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Advocate 1632
LLANGOLLEN SCHOOL BOARD—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts; Answer, Vice President of the Council 1632
FISHERY INQUIRY (LISTOWEL) — Question, Captain Donelan; Answer, Attorney General for Ireland 1633
POWELL v. KEMPTON PARK COMPANY—Question, Sir J. Kennaway; Answer, Attorney General 1634
TITHE REDEMPTION (FEES)—Question, Mr. Jeffreys; Answer, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1634
JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT—Questions, Mr. Greene and Mr. Miller; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1635
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1635
CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1636
BRITISH MUSEUM—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, First Lord of the Treasury 1636
CRETE—Questions, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1636
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Captain Sinclair and Sir William Harcourt; Answers, First Lord of the Treasury 1637

[*May* 31.] Page

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill:—Considered in Committee [Progress, 27th May.]

Clause 1,—(Liability of Certain Employers to Workmen for Injuries.) ... 1638

New Sub-section *(Mr. Ascroft)* agreed to.—Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Clause 1640

Clause 2,—(Application of Act and Definitions) :—

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), to leave out the word "mine."—*(Mr. Maclean)* 1641

Amendment withdrawn 1653

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "agriculture."—*(Mr. Goulding)* 1653

Question put, "That the word 'agriculture' be inserted."—The Committee divided :—Ayes, 123 ; Noes, 175.—(Division List, No. 226) 1676

Amendment proposed, after the word "quarry," to insert the word "shop"—*(Mr. Woods)*—Withdrawn 1676

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "ship."—*(Sir F. Evans)* 1676

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, to add after the word "ship," the words "while in any port or harbour of the United Kingdom."—*(Sir H. S. King)* 1682

Amendment to the proposed Amendment withdrawn 1696

Question put, "That the word 'ship' be there inserted.' —The Committee divided :—Ayes, 117 ; Noes, 209.—(Division List, No. 227) ... 1701

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "lift"—*(Sir C. Dilke)*—Negatived 1701

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "tramway."—*(Mr. Harrison)* 1701

Question put, "That the word 'tramway' be there inserted." The Committee divided :—Ayes, 99 ; Noes, 195.—(Division List, No. 228) 1702

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the word "employment," to insert the words,—

"in any place where material is being prepared for building work, or where any building is in course of construction"—*(Mr. Broadhurst)*—Withdrawn 1702

Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (1), after the words "about a," to insert the word "shipyard."—*(Mr. J. A. Pease)* 1704

Committee report Progress... 1705

Public Offices (Whitehall) Site Re-committed Bill :—Committee deferred ... 1705

Patent Office Extension (Re-committed) Bill :—Committee deferred 1705

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill :—Read the Third time, and passed ... 1705

Post Offices (Sites) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1705

[*May* 31.] *Page*

SUPPLY—[28TH MAY] :—Resolutions reported.
CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8 :—
Class I.
Resolutions 1, 2, 3, 4 agreed to 1705
Class II.
Resolutions 5, 7, 8, 9 agreed to 1707
Resolution 6 postponed 1707

Metropolitan Water Companies Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1707

Dangerous Performances Bill :—Read a Second time, and committed for Thursday 1707

Law of Evidence (Criminal Cases) Bill :—Committee deferred 1707

Land Transfer Bill [H.L.] :—Second Reading deferred 1707

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill :—Second Reading deferred ... 1707

Extraordinary Tithe Bill :—Committee deferred 1707

Berriew School Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Third Reading [24th May] further adjourned 1707

Prisons Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1707

Police (Property) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1708

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] :—Committee deferred 1708

Poor Law Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1708

Finance Bill :—Committee deferred 1708

Foreign Prison-Made Goods Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned 1708

School Boards Expenses Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1708

Bicycles (Ireland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1708

Local Government (Aldershot and Farnborough) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned 1708

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill :—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned 1708

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill [H.L.] :—Second Reading deferred ... 1709

Stipendiary Magistrates' Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1709

SUPPLY :—Committee deferred 1709

WAYS AND MEANS :—Committee deferred 1709

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1709

Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1709

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill :—Committee deferred 1709

Fisheries (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Second Reading deferred 1709

[*May* 31.]

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill:—Considered in Committee.—Clause 1. Committee report progress 1709

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) (Compulsory Purchase Powers) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1710

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill:—Committee deferred 1710

Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1710

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned 1710

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1710

Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned 1710

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1710

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill:—Second Reading deferred ... 1710

Vehicles (Lights) Bill:—Committee deferred 1711

Archdeaconry of London (Additional) Endowments Bill:—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned 1711

Cotton Cloth and Other Factories Bill:—Read a Second time and committed ... 1711

Police Appointment and Promotion Bill:—Second Reading deferred 1711

Labour Bureaux Bill:—Second Reading deferred till To-morrow 1712

Licensing Exemption (Houses of Parliament) Bill:—Second Reading deferred till To-morrow 1712

London Water Companies Amalgamation Bill:—Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June 1712

Verminous Persons Bill:—As amended, considered; to be Read the Third time To-morrow 1712

END OF VOLUME XLIX.

BILLS DEALT WITH IN VOL. XLIX.

Title of Bill.	*Progress.*
Agriculture and Industries (Ireland)	Withdrawn, May 24.
Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland)	Read 3ª and Passed, May 25.
Archdeaconry of Cornwall	Read 3ª and Passed, May 14.
Berriew School	Debate on Third Reading, May 24.
Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland)	Debate on Second Reading, May 11.
Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland)	Withdrawn, May 10.
Canals Protection (London)	Withdrawn, May 27.
Chaff-cutting Machines Accidents	Committed to Standing Committee on Trade, May 12.
Church Patronage Transfer [H.L.]	Re-committed to Standing Committee, May 28.
Colonial Solicitors	Read 1º, May 12.
Commons (Regulation)	Read 1º, May 11.
Conveyancing	Read 2ª and Referred to Select Committee, May 13.
Copyright Amendment	Read 2ª and Referred to Select Committee, May 31.
Cotton, Cloth, and other Factories	Read 2º, May 31.
Dangerous Performances	Read 2º, May 31.
District Councils (Water Supply Facilities)	Read 1º, May 18.
Dublin Corporation	Read 2ª, May 14.
East India Company's Officers' Superannuation	Read 3ª and Passed, May 17.
East London Water	Debate on Instruction, May 13.
Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage)	Read 3ª and Passed, May 18.
Election Petitions	Withdrawn, May 24.
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment	Read 3ª and Passed, May 31.
Elementary Education (Permissive Rates Aid)	Withdrawn, May 18.
Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment	Read 1º, May 26.
Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2)	Read 1º, May 27.
Excise Licences [H.L.]	Read 1ª, May 25.
Extraordinary Tithe	Read 2º, May 11.
Finance	In Committee, May 24.
Fisheries Acts Amendment [H.L.]	Read 1ª, May 14.
Floods Prevention	Read 1ª, May 31.
Foreign Prison-Made Goods	Read 2º, May 13.
Ground Game Act (Extension to Copyholders)	Read 1º, May 18.
Highgate Woods Preservation	Read 1º, May 18.
Industries (Ireland)	Withdrawn, May 25.
Infant Life Protection	Read 3ª and Passed, May 24.
Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) [H.L.]	Read 1º, May 17.
Juries Detention	Read 3ª and Passed, May 31.
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire)	Second Reading Negatived, May 19.

Title of Bill.	*Progress.*
Land Transfer	Read 1°, May 13.
Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment	Read 1°, May 24.
Liverpool City Churches	Read 2°, May 24.
Llandudno Urban District Council	Read 3° and Passed, May 20.
Local Authorities (Scotland) Loans	Withdrawn, May 24.
Local Government Act (1888) Amendment	Read 1°, May 12.
Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2)	Read 1°, May 18.
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway	Re-committed to Select Committee, May 13.
Locomotives on Highways	Read 2°, and Committed, May 28.
Lunacy [H.L.]	Read 1ª, May 21.
Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland)	Read 1ª, May 28.
Married Women (Ireland)	Read 1°, May 19.
Merchant Shipping (Undermanning)	Read 3° and Passed, May 31.
Mersey Channels	Re-committed to Standing Committee, May 28.
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts	Read 2°, and Committed, May 11.
Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays)	Read 3ª and Passed, May 18.
Metropolitan Water Companies	Read 1°, May 24.
Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment	Read 3ª and Passed, May 20.
Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration	Read 1°, May 24.
Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1)	Read 2°, May 17.
Plumbers' Registration	Reported, May 13.
Police and Stolen Property	Read 1°, May 20.
Polling Arrangements (London)	Withdrawn, May 24.
Poor Law	Read 1°, May 17.
Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment	In Committee, May 20.
Poor Law Relief (Ireland)	Withdrawn, May 24.
Post Office Consolidation	Read 2°, May 11.
Post Office (Sites)	Read 1°, May 13.
Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act (1888) Amendment	Read 3ª and Passed, May 17.
Prisons	Read 1°, May 20.
Provisional Order (Scotland)	Read 2° and Committed, May 20.
Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland)	Read 3ª and Passed, May 21.
Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation	Read 3ª and Passed, May 18.
Railway Clearing House [H.L.]	Debate on Instruction, May 27.
Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds	Read 3ª and Passed, May 17.
Restraint of Evictions (London)	In Committee, May 31.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland)	In Committee, May 13.
School Boards' Expenses	Read 1°, May 17.
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment	In Committee, May 19.
Trusts (Scotland)	Read 3ª and Passed, May 13.
Vehicles (Lights)	In Committee, May 18.
Verminous Persons Bill	Considered as Amended, May 31
Volunteers	Read 2ª and Committed, May 24.
Weights and Measures (Metric System)	Read 1°, May 27.
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents)	In Committee, May 31.

ERRATUM.

Page 385—*line* 56. *Read*:—

"The forces comprised 1,230 Imperial and 4,192 local troops."

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Authorised Edition)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT* OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*
APPOINTED TO MEET JANUARY 19, 1897, IN THE SIXTIETH YEAR OF
THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1897.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 7th May 1897.

TRUSTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.]

Report of Amendments (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Monday next.

ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL BILL.

Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

THE EARL OF MORLEY (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) asked Her Majesty's Government what arrangements it was proposed to make for distributing to Peers and officers of the House tickets to witness the procession on June 22?

THE EARL OF PEMBROKE (LORD STEWARD): I am informed by the First Commissioner of Works that the Lord Great Chamberlain has undertaken the distribution of tickets for the official stand for the use of Peers desiring to view the Royal Procession. Application for seats should be sent to the Lord Great Chamberlain's Secretary. The stand will be placed in front of the National Gallery, and I have no doubt that the Lord Great Chamberlain will adopt the suggestion of the noble Earl as to provision being made for the officers of the House.

THE EARL OF ANCASTER (LORD GREAT CHAMBERLAIN): I propose to send out a letter to every Peer stating that one ticket will be provided free of charge, and that two more can be obtained at the price of 12s. 6d. each.

House Adjourned at Twenty-five Minutes before Five o'Clock, to Monday next, a Quarter before Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 7th May 1897.

QUESTIONS.

MODEL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) does the Inquiry into the model schools cover the question of the greater expenditure per head on the pupils of these schools as compared with those in other national schools; if not, what is the explanation of this discrepancy; (2) could he give the percentage of passes under the two systems as a whole, or any other basis of comparison between them, as to educational results, and the percentage of passes in one or two of the best model schools and one or two of the best convent national schools; and (3) when will the evidence and Report be ready for presentation to Parliament?

*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. Of the total number of pupils examined in the year 1895, in ordinary national schools, model schools, and convent and monastery national schools, the percentage of passes was 80·7, 88·7, and 91·8 respectively. It would be invidious to select individual schools for purposes of comparison. It is not possible at present to fix a date for the completion of the documents referred to in the last paragraph, as the Inquiry is still in progress, and may continue for some time longer. I think it would be desirable to take the opinion of the Commissioners before promising that the evidence and Report will be laid on the Table.

EVICTION (CO. LONGFORD).

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland can he state the circumstances under which the eviction of Eliza Quinn, of Prucklish, County Longford, was carried out; whether the tenancy was then vested in her son-in-law, without the usual terms of redemption being allowed; and, whether this person is now the statutory tenant, and in that capacity is he receiving police protection?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Mrs. Quinn was evicted on the 21st January last for non-payment of three and a half years' rent and costs. The notice under Section 7 of the Land Act of 1887 was served on the 3rd June, 1896, so that the tenant had ample time to redeem in the seven months intervening prior to her eviction. On the day following her eviction, her son-in-law got possession of the holding, of which he is now the statutory tenant. No special arrangements have been made by the police for his protection.

LONGFORD CANAL HARBOUR.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will direct a Board of Trade Inquiry into the circumstances under which Michael M'Nally lost his life in the canal harbour at Longford, with a view to fixing the blame on the proper shoulders for the unprotected state of the harbour?

The HON. MEMBER further asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he will made good his promise in the early part of this Session to favourably consider any Bill which would enable local authorities or canal companies to enclose those parts of their basins or canals in which human life has been frequently lost; whether he is aware that the canal harbour at Longford comes within this category, and that there has been a man drowned there so lately as 28th March last; whether he will examine the Canals and Navigable Rivers Bill, at present before the House, with a view to the adoption of some scheme to compel the inclosure of this dangerous basin?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): answer the hon. Member's questions together. The Board of Trade have no power to order such an Inquiry as that desired, and as it is a case which obviously falls under the jurisdiction of the Coroner, there should be no difficulty in fixing the blame on the proper shoulders. With respect to that portion of the hon.

Gentleman's Question referring to proposed legislation, I think if the hon. Gentleman will refer to my previous answers, he will find I gave no such promise as he indicates. Any legislation of such a nature, if desirable, should in my opinion not be limited to Ireland. If the Bill referred to comes on for consideration in the House, I will carefully consider the arguments urged in its favour.

SCOTS GREYS.

Mr. J. H. C. HOZIER (Lanark, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether it is the case that the standard of height for the Royal Scots Greys has been reduced by two inches; and, if so, for what cavalry regiments recruits between 5 feet 9 inches and 5 feet 11 inches in height can now be enlisted?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): There is a difficulty in mounting heavy men abroad, while, on the other hand, tall recruits are required for the Foot Guards and for artillery gunners. Therefore, during the last few years the standard for Line cavalry regiments has been gradually reduced, and recruits are not taken above 5ft. 9in. in height. When the Scots Greys and the Royals were recently brought on the foreign service roster, their standard was reduced accordingly. As men are not taken for the Household Cavalry under 5 ft. 11 in. there is no cavalry opening for men between that height and 5 ft. 9 in.

Mr. HOZIER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a recruit who has enlisted, or may enlist, specially for the Royal Scots Greys will, under the new scheme, be liable, during the term of his service, to be transferred against his wish to any other dragoon regiment?

Mr. BRODRICK: Recruits have been enlisted since 1893 for the Corps of Dragoons, and are liable to be called upon to serve in any regiment of that corps. A man who enlisted previously for the Scots Greys cannot be transferred against his wish.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the grants due to schools whose school year ended on or before the 31st March last, but not paid till after the passing of the Voluntary Schools Act, are liable to deduction under what is commonly known as the 17s. 6d. limit; and whether any deduction under that limit will be made in grants paid to schools on account of school years ending between 31st March 1897 and 31st March 1898?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Sir John Gorst, Cambridge University): The 17s. 6d. limit will cease to affect the grants payable to schools whose school years end on or after March 31, 1897.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, assuming that Section 97 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, be amended as from the 29th day of September 1897, the grants paid to necessitous School Boards after that date on the average attendance for the year ending 29th September 1897 will be subject to the new conditions as set out in the amending Bill?

Sir J. GORST: Yes, Sir.

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, on what basis the additional good conduct stripes for postmen, recommended by the Tweedmouth Committee, will be distributed; is it the case that a man with 30 years' unblemished record already possessing three stripes, the maximum number formerly granted, will only receive one additional stripe forthwith instead of three as recommended by the Committee, and will thus be no better off than a man with 20 years' service; will a postman of 30 years' service have to serve another 10 years before he is entitled to his sixth stripe; and will the auxiliary and substituting service performed prior to the 1st April 1897 be taken into account in awarding stripes?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The additional good conduct stripes will be awarded on the following basis: A man already in possession of three good conduct stripes will receive at once an additional good conduct stripe for every five years' unblemished service since the date of the last award. Thus a man who since he received his third stripe has five years good service will receive one stripe; 10 years' good service two stripes; or 15 years' good service three stripes. Auxiliary service will be taken into account as regards the award of good conduct stripes to men who have none. Two years' good service in an auxiliary capacity will be reckoned as one year toward stripes. As regards what is known as substituting service, it is as a rule intermittent and not continuous. Intermittent service would not count for stripes.

MR. STUART: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what will be the total saving that will ultimately be effected by the abolition of the allowances paid to provincial postmen in lieu of Christmas boxes and for special duties, also by the abolition of the allowances at present paid to the London sorting staff?

MR. HANBURY: None of the allowances to provincial postmen can be properly described as allowances in lieu of Christmas boxes, seeing that they are in all cases assigned to special duties, and they will be continued to present recipients so long as the special duties are performed by them. It is estimated that the total saving ultimately to be effected by the gradual abolition of the allowances will amount in the case of the provincial postmen to £29,000 a year and in the case of the London sorters to £10,500 a year. But it is calculated that the higher salaries to be paid will much more than counterbalance this saving in allowances.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): May I ask whether people are prohibited from giving Christmas boxes to postmen if they choose to continue the practice?

MR. HANBURY: Oh, no, Sir; the prohibition is only directed against the solicitation by postmen. There is no reason whatever why people should not give them Christmas boxes if they choose to do so.

SIR H. FOWLER: I asked the Question because I thought it desirable that if that were the case it should be known. ["Hear, hear!"]

WATER SUPPLY (URSWICK).

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the defective water supply of the villages of Much and Little Urswick; whether there has been a Local Government Board Inquiry which disclosed defects in the water supply; and whether he can take any steps to remedy the same?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Local Government Board have been satisfied, as the result of local inquiries by their inspectors, that the villages of Great and Little Urswick are in need of a proper water supply. The villages, however, though forming part of the Ulverstone Rural District, are within the limits of supply of the Ulverstone Urban District Council. This and other exceptional features of the case have appeared to the Board to render it difficult for them to take compulsory action against the Rural Council. The Board, however, have urged the Rural Council to negotiate with the Urban Council for the necessary supply; and the Councils have been in communication on the subject. But the Board understand that there is objection by owners and ratepayers to the expenses, and apparently the Rural District Council are not taking further action in the matter.

TRANSVAAL (JAMESON RAID).

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any reply has been made to the Note of the Transvaal Government of 16th February, enclosing bill of indemnity to be paid or to be caused to be paid by Her Majesty's Government for the raid made by Dr. Jameson and the British South African Company's troops; and, if so, what was the reply?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Correspondence is proceeding on the subject, but I am not likely to be in a position to make any statement to the House for some time.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

Mr. J. W. MACLURE (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will instruct the officials at Somerset House not to claim any extra Income Tax or other taxes from permanent residents in London or in the country generally for seats let by them on the occasion of the joyous celebration of Her Most Gracious Majesty's 60 years' reign?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.): I cannot instruct the Inland Revenue authorities to abstain from claiming from a particular class of taxpayers any duties which may be legally due from them.

Mr. HARRY FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if any provision has been made in the proposed erection of stands on the occasion of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee for the commissioned officers of the Army, including veteran officers who served in the Crimea and the Indian Mutiny?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Stands will be erected on the occasion of Her Majesty's Jubilee for officers both of the Army and Navy. The distribution of tickets will be in the hands of the War Office and Admiralty respectively.

Captain PHILLPOTTS (Devon, Torquay): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is intended that Her Majesty's Naval and Marine Forces should be represented on the occasion of the Jubilee celebrations by detachments from those forces forming part of the procession to and from St. Paul's Cathedral?

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square): It has been settled, as I understand, that the procession on the day of the Jubilee celebration is to be confined exclusively to mounted men, so that the Bluejackets and Marines who will represent the Navy on the occasion will not be included in the actual procession; but, as the Bluejackets will be distributed over different parts of the route, and will be marched to their stations along the route in strong contingents, as much opportunity as possible will be given to the spectators to see them march past.

STRABANE EQUITY SESSIONS.

Mr. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to a case at the Strabane Equity Sessions on Friday, 9th April, where a civil bill officer, named Thomas K. Howe, brought an action against Mrs. Margaret Murphy, a widow, to compel specific performance of an agreement for the sale of a farm at a place called Woodend; is he aware that it was disclosed in evidence that the bailiff Howe, accompanied by a clerk, took to the defendant an agreement ready drawn, which he compelled her to sign, although she begged for time to consult her solicitor; and that the Judge, Sir Francis Brady, Q.C., in dismissing the case with costs, stated that Howe had taken the defendant at a disadvantage, and had refused to allow her to have legal advice; and also that the solicitor had not taken a wise course in acting in the case for both parties; and will he call the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the conduct of Mr. Howe as a civil bill officer?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Civil bill officers are under the control, not of the Lord Chancellor, but of the County Court Judges. A copy of the Question of the hon. Member has been referred to the learned Judge, Sir Francis Brady.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND).

Mr. JAMES E. B. BAILLIE (Inverness): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate when the Bill dealing with the Government proposals regarding the congested districts in the Highlands will be presented to the House?

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Graham Murray, Buteshire): I regret I cannot at present name a date for the introduction of the Bill dealing with the congested districts of the Highlands.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND).

Sir CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether female sub-inspectors are employed under the English Education Department; and, if so, how many are thus employed?

Sir J. GORST: Yes, Sir; two.

WATERFORD, DUNGARVAN AND LISMORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of a promise he made to a deputation of ratepayers who waited on him last week, when he will be in a position to inform the ratepayers of the county and city of Waterford, who are paying £14,000 a year to the Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway Company, what action the Government propose to take with regard to that Company; and whether the scheme which the Treasury stated they were considering, and which they promised would be submitted to the ratepayers before being adopted, will be made known before the Vote for the Board of Works is taken?

Mr. HANBURY: I have already informed a deputation, of which the hon. Gentleman was a member, that before any arrangement was finally completed I would make public what our general proposal was, and postpone the Board of Works Vote in order to afford an opportunity for its discussion, if necessary. The decision must, of course, rest with the Treasury and the House of Commons, though the interest of the ratepayers and others concerned will be fully borne in mind. I must repeat, however, what I stated to the deputation—that the locality served by the line is not in the same position as a congested district.

Mr. P. J. POWER: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is the fact, as reported in the Welsh papers, that the Midland Railway Company of England are negotiating for the purchase of this line; and I wish further to ask him, in connection with his reply, how he will arrange to take the opinion of the people concerned on this matter?

Mr. HANBURY: I made no promise to take the opinion of the ratepayers. I only said that they should be informed before the decision was arrived at.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF IRELAND.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the footbridge so long promised to be erected by the Great Northern Railway Company at Castleblaney has not been commenced yet; whether he is aware that the Great Northern Railway Company at Castleblaney shunt trains over this level crossing, and that the public are greatly inconvenienced and delayed by the railway gates being closed several times a day while trains are crossing and shunting going on; and whether he can state what course he intends to take in this matter, or when will this long promised bridge be erected?

Mr. RITCHIE: The Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland inform the Board of Trade that the plans for a footbridge are now completed, and that tenders for carrying out the work will be invited immediately.

LAND COMMISSION.

Mr. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a great many applications by farmers from the vicinity of Castleblaney to have fair rents fixed on their holdings has been made to the Irish Land Commissioners before November last, and that many of these farms have not yet been viewed by the Sub-Commissioners, and whether he can say when these farms will be inspected and decisions given?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Land Commissioners inform me that it has not yet been possible for the Sub-Commission to hear all the cases on the present Castleblaney list, but that they will be dealt with as rapidly as possible.

Mr. PATRICK M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that no Land Commission has sat in the county Sligo for the past six months, and whether he can say how many cases are now awaiting hearing in that county, and when the Commission will visit Sligo?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: A Sub-Commission sat for the disposal of cases in the county of Sligo in October last.

A further Sub-Commission will commence the hearing of cases from the unions of Sligo, Tubbercurry and Boyle on the 14th instant. There are 329 cases in the county Sligo which have not yet been listed for hearing.

WRECK (SS. "MEMPHIS").

SIR GEORGE BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, since the recent wreck of the ss. *Memphis* on the Mizen Head, the question has been revived of establishing a fog signal on the Three Castles' Head; whether the Irish Light Commissioners have stated that such a fog signal would encourage vessels into danger; whether he is aware that the Liverpool Underwriters' Association and the Liverpool Steamship Owners' Association, numbering among its members all the large liners trading between Liverpool and America, and carrying a very great number of emigrants and other passengers, are very strongly of opinion that the establishment of such a fog signal would be of very material assistance in the safe navigation of those waters, especially in regard to vessels which in thick weather have got out of their course, and whether he can arrange that this strong request of those who at present contribute so largely to the cost of fog signal stations shall be carried into effect?

MR. RITCHIE: Representations have lately been made as to the desirability of establishing a fog signal on the Three Castles' Head, and I am informed that the Commissioners of Irish Lights have stated, in reply to such representations, that, in their opinion, the effect of such a fog signal would be to encourage vessels into danger. The Board of Trade have no statutory power to take the initiative in establishing fog signal stations.

NAVY (PULMONARY DISEASES).

CAPTAIN PHILLPOTTS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, out of a batch of 80 men surveyed at Haslar Hospital and found unfit for further service in Her Majesty's Navy, the majority were young stokers with less than six months' service, who were incapacitated by pulmonary complaints; and if the Government have any plan to check the development of such diseases among this class?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY: I have seen a statement to the effect of the hon. and gallant Member's Question, but it is entirely incorrect, and I regret its publication, as tending to create apprehensions for which there is no foundation. The statement suggests that, out of 80 men surveyed, the majority were young stokers with less than six months' service, incapacitated by pulmonary complaints. As a matter of fact, out of 76 men and boys who were invalided at Haslar last month on the occasion in question, only 18 were stokers, and of these, both young and old, only eight were found unfit on account of pulmonary disease. Of these eight, five were 22 years of age and upwards.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS BILL.

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, before proceeding further with the Metropolitan Police Courts Bill, he will lay upon the Table a statement showing the scale of salaries which, in the event of the Bill being passed into law, he proposes to establish for the clerks of the said Courts?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): The salaries of the Police Court Clerks formed the subject of a special Inquiry three years ago by the Consultative Committee established under the Order in Council of August, 1890, who recommended that the scale for second Clerks should be £100, rising to £350 by increments of £10 for the first six years, and of £15 afterwards, and for chief clerks £400, rising by £15 first and £20 afterwards to £600. The clerks, on the other hand, will not receive the profits arising from the sale of depositions, which will be paid to the Receiver. These recommendations were adopted by the Secretary of State.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, following the precedent set by his predecessor in 1874 on the occasion of an engagement then given to Parliament as to contributions to local rates in respect of Government property, he will embody in a Treasury Minute (and lay a copy thereof upon the Table) the engagement given in connection with the Metropolitan Police Courts Bill now before this House, that the Treasury will contribute to the Metropolitan Police Fund an annual sum of £7,000 in consideration of the services rendered by the Police to the Houses of Parliament?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I quite agree with the hon. Member that there should be some public record of the engagement to which he refers. I think that the best course will be for the Treasury and the Home Office to exchange letters on the subject and that the letters should be laid before Parliament.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to his statement that a debt of £8,000 is due to the Treasury by the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police in respect of the fabric of the Bow Street Police Court, will he say when and under what circumstances was this expenditure incurred; when was the claim to repayment first made; and has the Receiver of Metropolitan Police admitted the claim; and, if so, when, and in what form?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): The debt is in respect of the police station at Bow Street, not the Court. The station was built in 1881 by the Office of Works, and the cost, which was met in the first instance out of moneys voted by Parliament, is being repaid to the Treasury by instalments.

TREASON-FELONY PRISONERS (IRELAND).

MR. J. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received a copy of a Resolution adopted by the Legislative Council of Cape Colony, praying that Her Majesty's Government would see its way clear to advise Her Majesty to exercise her clemency towards certain prisoners undergoing punishment in connection with questions affecting the political condition of Ireland; and whether he has sent any, and, if so what, reply to that Resolution?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I received last year a Resolution adopted by the Legislative Council of the Cape Colony, in which the release of the Reform prisoners by the Government of the South African Republic was referred to, and a hope was expressed that like clemency would be extended by Her Majesty's Government towards prisoners undergoing punishment for similar offences in connection with questions affecting the political condition of Ireland. I replied that I was unable to admit that the offences of which the prisoners in this country referred to were guilty, and which included attempts at assassination and projected outrages endangering the lives of men, women and children in no way responsible for political action, bore any resemblance to the purely political offences charged against the members of the Johannesburg Reform Committee. [*Cheers.*]

FALKLAND ISLANDS.

MR. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Governor of the Falkland Islands has forwarded a Dispatch to the Colonial Office urging the Government to abolish the office of Colonial Surgeon in the Falkland Islands and to establish in substitution thereof two official medical posts; whether the Hon. Samuel Hamilton, a member of the Legislative Council, who has filled for the last 18 years the post of Colonial Surgeon in the Falkland Islands, has forwarded a memorial to the Colonial Secretary in which he has stated his views, which are directly opposed to the recommendation of the Government; whether he has yet arrived at a decision on the matter; and whether, having regard to the length of Dr. Hamilton's service and efficient discharge of his duties as Colonial Surgeon, care will be taken in the event of any alteration in the medical establishment of the Falkland Islands to safeguard his interests, and to secure him full compensation for any loss such alteration may entail?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No such Dispatch has reached me, nor has the matter been under my consideration.

TRANSVAAL (IMMIGRATION LAW).

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I wish to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies a Question of which I have given him private notice—whether it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that the Volksraad have repealed the Immigration Law, and whether this action is taken in accordance with a letter sent to the Volksraad by the South African Government themselves.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have seen the statements in the newspapers and I have no reason to disbelieve them. At the same time I have not received official confirmation, but I need hardly add that if the statements should turn out to be true it will greatly relieve the tension which has existed, unfortunately, between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the Transvaal. [*Cheers.*]

POOR LAW RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. T. M. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary whether, after what took place the previous evening, he would attempt to proceed on Monday with the Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill, or whether he would hold it over for further consideration?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not see why it should not be proceeded with in consequence of what happened last night. I hope it will be reached in sufficient time to allow of ample discussion.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give proper facilities for its discussion?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I understand that the principle of the Bill is generally accepted.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: It raises the whole question of rating and control.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (MORNING SITTINGS).

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I beg to give notice, on behalf of the Leader of the House, that on Monday he proposes to move that morning sittings be taken on Tuesdays.

Captain BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness): What business will be taken on Tuesday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I cannot state now, but very likely it will be the Budget Resolutions.

MINING ACCIDENT (DURHAM).

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) asked for information as to the mining accident in Durham.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said that when he left the Home Office there was no information then. He had sent since to ascertain whether information had arrived, and he expected to receive it every minute.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

[SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY.]

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

Class II.—Crete.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £49,705, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Mr. ROBSON (South Shields) moved

> "That Item A (Salaries), be reduced by £500, in respect of the salary of the Secretary of State."

He said that when the Eastern Question was last before the House hon. Members were asked to wait patiently while the Government pursued a policy which the First Lord of the Treasury described as one of peace in Europe and freedom in Crete. That policy up to the present had brought us to war in Europe and anarchy in Crete. There were many hon. Members on both sides of the House who, in listening to that phrase, reflected that it perhaps expressed the Prime Minister's aspiration rather than his policy. In every quarter of the globe when the present Foreign Secretary had to face a strong Power he had shown always the same unvarying weakness; and it was scarcely to be expected that he would be likely to change his political character in a crisis like this, which needed courage as the first essential of any policy. British interests had been surrendered without a blow, almost without a word, in Siam and Madagascar, and more important than all, in Eastern Asia. They had seen arbitration refused to Venezuela and then granted in consequence of a menace which he thought was without a parallel in the history of our diplomacy. They were not surprised, with these events in their recollection, that the Prime Minister should have betaken himself to the European Concert, for just as the isolation of England, which he had done so much to promote, was his excuse for a policy of surrender, so he found in the European Concert an excellent cover and excuse for a policy of drift. [*Cheers.*] No one had explained better than the Prime Minister what the proper view of the European Concert was. To listen to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs one would suppose the European Concert was a new device for which this Government was entitled to claim the credit. It was, however, a very old device. There was always a Concert of Europe for the oppression of the smaller Powers. This was what the Prime Minister said of the European Concert in 1878 as to the Treaty of Paris, which now apparently was the corner-stone of English policy:—

> "I am not alarmed even by the condemnation passed on it by the noble Lord (Ripon) when he declares that we have departed from the European Concert. What will the future historian think of the European Concert when he comes to record what that Concert has promised and what it has performed? The European Concert of 1856 was to preserve the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire, and certainly a more imposing machinery could not be devised. But 20 years have passed. . . . . Not one member of the European Concert has lifted its hand in defence of the integrity of the Turkish Empire. . . . . I think it is better that we should come to a simpler form of engagement in which, only two Powers being mixed up, there can be no doubt as to the pledges being fulfilled."

The European Concert was then on the side of liberty, but the moment it ranged itself against liberty then they had the Prime Minister availing himself of its shelter in order to excuse his policy. [*Cheers.*] It would be said that this European Concert had procured at least the promises of great reforms. It was on those reforms, which had gone to the extent of autonomy, that the Government relied for their excuse in subordinating the influence of England and in lending the Navy of England to the great Powers of Europe. The Government put forward the projected reforms and their scheme of autonomy as their excuse for a policy which had had the effect of strengthening Turkey and Russia, and of destroying the Power which, beyond any other Power in Eastern Europe, the English people desired to see maintained and extended. But the reforms and the autonomy of which the Government made so much were futile—he might go further and dub them a deliberate sham. Whenever a promise of reforms was obtained from the Turks, one question was always carefully shirked by the diplomatists—namely, the question of expense and the payment of the soldiery or new gendarmerie. The result was that the promised constitution was left in suspense, and probably fresh massacres occurred. What had occurred in Crete was quite in accordance with all previous experience. Twelve months after Lord Salisbury had obtained from the Sultan a promise of reforms in Armenia, he declared in the House of Lords:—

> "Until the finance of the Porte is brought to a satisfactory state we cannot expect any *bonâ fide* reforms. Nothing costs money like administrative reform."

It was this question of expense which the British Government and the Concert of Europe had again failed to face; and, that being so, Crete and Greece knew—and he ventured to add Lord Salisbury also—that the promised reforms were absolutely illusory, and the war became obviously inevitable. The Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs had lauded the proposed autonomy as an advance on all previous promises made by the Porte. It had, however, been shown that this autonomy could not be a cure for Cretan difficulties, because the islanders refused it 20 years ago. It was, in fact, a stale and exhausted device. As a matter of fact Crete had already in appearance a far better constitution than we had. There was a general assembly which met every year, and which was elected by the whole population. The imposts and duties were carefully limited, and the expenditure was under popular control. There was a Christian governor for every Christian district, assisted by a Christian council; and there was a Mussulman governor for every Mussulman district, with whom was associated a Christian deputy governor as coadjutor. There was a gendarmerie, supposed to be recruited from Christians and Mussulmans indifferently, and finally, this great theoretical constitution was safeguarded by the most absolute liberty of the Press. Before offering Crete new conditions it ought to have occurred to the Government—as it would have to any mere practical man—to ask why a constitution so ample and perfect in theory had been a ridiculous and disastrous failure. The answer was supplied by the presence of the Turkish troops in the island. ["Hear, hear!"] As long as they were there there must, of course, be a military commander who acted as military governor. The troops had to be paid, and did the Government imagine that the Sultan was likely to send them money from his not overflowing Treasury, upon which there were so many demands, political and domestic? [*Laughter.*] Why had not the Government told the people of Crete how this important financial question was to be settled? Why had they not said that under their scheme the Cretans would not be called upon to pay tribute to the Sultan? It was not likely that autonomous Cretans were going to collect money to send to Constantinople. This financial question had been disregarded, but it must be settled or the proffered autonomy would remain a palpable sham. The Cretans were fighting for three things which were not met by the proposals of the Powers. They demanded the expulsion of the Turkish troops—["hear, hear!"]—the right to arm and form themselves into a national militia, and freedom from Turkish tribute and taxes. The Powers, by insisting on the maintenance of the Turkish troops in the island, had practically refused to grant those demands, and that was the cause of the present difficulty. With regard to Armenia, according to the admission of the Prime Minister himself, England could do nothing alone. It seemed to be the Prime Minister's glory to have brought his country in relation to the Armenian question into a sort of moral bankruptcy. ["Hear, hear!"] The obligation was there, but the power to fulfil it did not exist. But if that was the case with Armenia, no one could say that it was the case with Crete. ["Hear, hear!"] Not only were we under an obligation there, but we possessed the power to fulfil it. With regard to Armenia, it was said that we could not send our Fleet over the mountains into Asia Minor; but we were masters of the Mediterranean. What, then, was lacking but the courage? ["Hear, hear!"] Why was the complete expulsion of the Turkish troops not demanded by the Concert of Europe? It was said that it was not demanded because one of the Powers imposed its veto. Which of the Powers, then, imposed its veto? Only one Power had the slightest interest in Crete, and that was Russia, who might possibly desire to have Crete as a place of refuge for her fleet. Russia appeared to have raised her finger to the Prime Minister, and that was enough. ["Hear, hear!"] The Jingoism which had so long intoxicated itself to platform swagger—[*Ministerial laughter and cheers*]—had resulted in a policy of surrender, and now, when the Party which had a monopoly of English patriotism and Imperialism was faced by a single Power in the Concert, it yielded, and said, "We must not leave the Concert, because, if we do, we cannot do anything for Crete." ["Hear, hear!"] To such an extent had the effacement of England gone in the course of two years that, unless she marched to the three Emperors, she must not move. [*Cheers.*] Unless she pledged and pawned her credit and influence and Navy she must sit perfectly still, and have no policy at all. That was what had come of the policy of bounce and bastard Imperialism. [*Cheers.*] The defence the Prime Minister made in his speech yesterday was a very remarkable one, for he now based his policy on the high and solemn ground of the sanctity of treaties, and particularly of the Treaty of Paris, a Treaty which had been broken over and over again by every party that affixed its name to it, a Treaty which had been ignored by everyone, and which the Prime Minister 20 years ago treated as a wholly negative instrument. ["Hear, hear!"] That Treaty had now become a sacred obligation in the view of the Prime Minister, an obligation of such remarkable and mysterious sanctity that it was superior to all moral obligations. Some time ago the country was told that it had put its money on the wrong horse, but, according to yesterday's speech, we had bought the wrong horse. The Prime Minister suggested that the horse had turned out a kicker. It was bought unconditionally. By that Treaty we became unconditionally bound to the integrity of the Turkish Empire, and in the name of all that was high and holy and legal we must allow no one to limit the sphere of its operations. That was the excuse now made for the policy of the Government, and he ventured to describe that policy as not only wicked, but stupid. ["Hear, hear!"] The fact was that no Member of the Government knew what any other Member of the Government meant by the independence and integrity of Turkey. In the same speech in which the Under Secretary likened the Turkish Empire to a bankrupt stock, he went on to talk of the integrity of the Turkish Empire as being consecrated and enshrined in the Code of Europe—whatever the Code of Europe might mean—["hear, hear!"]—and as being a part of international law which Europe alone could modify. There was no law, least of all international law, which could give any title against its own subjects to a Government which systematically encouraged massacre and plunder. ["Hear, hear!"] To say that Europe alone could modify the integrity of such an empire, was to condemn millions of its subjects to outrage. ["Hear, hear!"] If they were not strong enough in themselves to get reforms, they were entitled, whether Europe liked it or not, to invoke those of their own race and creed outside their border. It was monstrous to say that to give such assistance was a breach of international law, and an immoral and unholy act. ["Hear, hear!"] The Opposition were told over and over again that they were sentimental. He was not ashamed of that. ["Hear, hear!"] In 1878, when the Prime Minister was pursuing the same course which he was now pursuing, the sentimentalists objected. What was the result? He failed in his policy in Bulgaria. The establishment of a peaceful, and prosperous, and an independent State was the result. He had succeeded in his policy in Armenia, and what had been the result? He was unable to say enough to give a description of the Prime Minister's success there—a success which had been absolutely disastrous. Yet he was spoken of as a Nestor among European statesmen, always strong and resolute, never drifting, never surrendering the honour of England. [*Cheers and Opposition laughter.*] They had only to remember that contrast, that failure in Bulgaria and success in Armenia. The sentimentalists were right then, and he thought the sentimentalists would come well out of the present contest. Sentimentalists might not always be well informed, but it was wiser than the cynicism and indifference to the broad mass of sympathy which moved mankind. ["Hear, hear!"] But there was a stupidity worse than that. There was a stupidity of brutality, and if the policy which had now been sketched by a high authority were carried out it would be a policy of brutality. It seemed to be the same policy which the Tory Party pursued in 1878, and no doubt it would meet with the same condemnation at the hands of the English people. He begged to move the Motion which stood in his name.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) said that in the neighbourhood in which he resided this question commanded more attention than any other. He entirely concurred in the references of the hon. Member for South Shields (Mr. Robson), to sentiment and cynicism. The English people wanted to know on which side was placed the power and the influence of this country. ["Hear, hear!"] During the last year or two we had had recrudescences of what was called the Eastern Question, but this was only another way of explaining the crisis which occurred in the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. [*Opposition cheers.*] He wished to call the attention of the Committee to Armenia, because he thought that Armenia had been lost sight of during the past few weeks. During every Session of the present Parliament, Armenia had been brought before their notice in the Queen's Speech; and the Blue-books which had been issued to Members, in a somewhat belated fashion and in fragments—["hear, hear!"]—had been most awful and terrible reading. The perusal of these Blue-books had almost deprived him of sleep. He could not understand the constitution of the man who had waded through the pages of our own Consular Reports and Sir Philip Currie's Dispatch and did not feel his very nature almost changed by the horrors there disclosed. [*Opposition cheers.*] Irrespective of Party politics, all were agreed as to the awful character of the occurrences in Asia Minor. In Crete, too, there existed a state of things which all must regard as extremely unsatisfactory. In July last the Under Secretary of State promised Parliamentary Papers on the subject of Crete, but these Papers were not laid upon the Table of the House until March this year. When such circumstances were going on in Eastern Europe and in Crete no possible circumstances justified putting the right hon. Gentleman in this position, that the promise he made to the House in July was not fulfilled until March. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CURZON: I did not promise.

Mr. J. ELLIS assured the right hon. Gentleman that he had read every page of these Blue-books, and there was quite sufficient to show that the state of things was unsatisfactory in the highest degree. On the authority of our own Consuls there was the most conclusive evidences that the Turkish troops on one occasion fought during an armistice and at another time plundered the Christian inhabitants, while officers stood by without making the slightest attempt to interfere. These were only an illustration of what had occurred in hundreds of cases; but the vital point to consider now was, what had really been the policy of Great Britain under these circumstances? There was not a Government in Europe that had been more ready throughout the century to promise the granting of reforms on paper than the Porte; but there was the terrible commentary on the promises of the Sultan, that most terrible massacre at Constantinople, a massacre deliberately planned and arranged by the highest authorities in Constantinople. All the arrangements for the Constantinople massacre were deliberately made—[Mr. Gibson Bowles: "No!"]—by the highest authorities in Constantinople. He was astonished to hear the hon. Member for King's Lynn cast doubt upon it.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I absolutely deny it.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS said that something more than a mere assertion on the part of the hon. Gentleman was required. ["Hear, hear!"] Within the last few months there had been the massacre at Tokat. What would be asked in future was, how did Great Britain act through this crisis at the end of the 19th century? We stood to-day in a much worse position as regarded humanity and freedom than we did a year or two ago; England stood in a position of shameful and humiliating failure. He read with amazement and almost with indignation some of the sentences in Lord Salisbury's speech yesterday. His Lordship took Lord Kimberley to task in another place for his emphatic repudiation of the contention that we should maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and yet the First Lord of the Admiralty, speaking when they met on the 11th of February last year, said, "We are free from any engagement as to the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire." The right hon. Gentleman was Ambassador Extraordinary in 1881, knew the whole subject and was a Member of the present Cabinet, and therefore spoke with authority. How could the right hon. Gentleman's words be regarded for a single moment as consistent with Lord Salisbury's appeal to that most antiquated diplomacy the Treaty of Paris? Liberals read Lord Kimberley's declaration with the greatest pleasure, for his Lordship said:—

> "I say there is nothing in the Treaty or in the present situation of the world which should preclude anyone in my position from announcing, as I did announce, and I wish to announce, and to repeat, that I believe it is for the interest of this country, and it is for the interest of European peace, that we should be disconnected for ever from regarding the integrity of the Empire of Turkey as the basis of British policy."

The means by which the Government were trying to carry out their policy, whatever it might be, was the precious Concert, or, as Lord Salisbury called it, the Federation of Europe. With some people the Concert of Europe seemed to have become a sort of fetish; but that Concert, as at present revealed, was nothing more nor less than a Concert of the Emperors of the three despotic

Powers. Freedom seemed to be regarded as a sort of impertinence. He noticed in one of the Blue-books a most significant sentence in regard to the matter of freedom and insurrection. The Foreign Minister of one of the despotic Powers was reported to have said that—

> "the most important object to obtain is to make it clear that nothing is to be gained by revolt."

In his opinion, what Lord John Russell called the sacred right of insurrection must always be preserved. He protested against the idea that underlaid the sentence he had just quoted. We seemed to be going back 70 years; we might be living in the days of the Holy Alliance. The Layback Circular of 1821 contained the following words:—

> "Useful and necessary changes in legislation and in the administration of States ought only to emanate from the free will and well-defined conviction of those whom God has made responsible for power."

That Circular created a great sensation in this country. It was too strong for even the Castlereagh stomach, and the Government of the day were compelled by public opinion and by the opinion of the House of Commons to issue a Circular to the effect that such a policy as that was "in direct repugnance to the fundamental laws of the United Kingdom." He was not against a Concert of Europe, if it were a Concert of the right sort. But a Concert must be judged by its acts and its policy, and the value of a Concert or Federation entirely depended upon how far it was representative of the highest instincts of humanity. He, therefore, asked the Government now to declare what their policy was. Were they going to place the power, weight, majesty and might of this great country at the tail of the despotic Empires of Europe? He would give the Government the freest hand in regard to foreign policy, but Parliament ought to know the general principles at least on which the Government acted. If asked what Liberal principles were, he should say that Liberals denied that we were in any way bound up with that formula to which Lord Salisbury attached so much importance. They agreed with the First Lord of the Admiralty that we were not bound to raise hand or foot in defence of the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, and they contended that this country ought never to place any obstacle in the way of those populations, subjects of Turkey, who were struggling to be free. Above all, Governments and Concerts ought to have as their fundamental basis the welfare of the people governed. He hoped they would hear to-night that Her Majesty's Government had determined to no longer pursue that which seemed to him a most evil path.

CAPTAIN BETHELL (York, E. R., Holderness) said that the hon. Member for South Shields took the opportunity in the earlier part of his speech, which was specially devoted to the question of Crete and Greece, to make what he was sure the House would admit to be a grotesque caricature of the policy of Lord Salisbury. There had been some recent exhibitions of swagger on the platform, but it had not been by Conservative or Unionist statesmen. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Members opposite, almost without exception, refrained from saying what was the policy which they would wish the Government to pursue in the present circumstances. Three policies only could be followed. One was to take part in the Concert of Europe; another was to abstain; and a third was to fight for Greece. Did hon. Members wish that we had stood aside and not used that influence which had notoriously been used in favour of Greece? Did they think we should have taken up arms in favour of Greece? He was glad to have the opportunity of recording his opinion that, in this part of the question, in endeavouring to free Crete from the rule of the Turk, the Government had acted wisely and in the best interests of liberty. The last speaker had referred to the Holy Alliance, but did he believe that the present Foreign Minister was seeking, not to follow the policy of Mr. Canning, but to support the policy of the despots of the Holy Alliance? ["Hear, hear!"] There was not a word of evidence to show that the policy of Lord Salisbury had been other than one seeking to give the utmost liberty to those concerned. [*Cheers.*] Both hon. Gentlemen who had spoken had criticised what Lord Salisbury had recently said about the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. But the policy of Lord Salisbury had been clearly defined in the series of speeches which he had made during the last two years. The first of these, delivered at the Mansion House, was brimming with a policy of freedom, of endeavouring to liberate people who now in many cases groaned under the rule of the Turk. None of his recent speeches contradicted that policy.

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): What about his acts?

CAPTAIN BETHELL said there had been but one act since then—the freeing of Crete from the rule of the Turk. [*Cheers and cries of* "Oh!"] Hon. Members took umbrage at what Lord Salisbury said about the necessity of maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. But, as had been explained, that was but a useful phrase under which great areas of country had been freed from the rule of the Turk. Under that phrase, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Servia had been placed in a position of substantial and real independence; and it was not correct, therefore, to say that, in the policy he was now pursuing, Lord Salisbury was not acting in the interests of liberty. That policy received the support of the Unionist Party—a Party which was as strongly infused with the doctrine of freedom as were Gentlemen opposite, and which, though its views were not expressed so emotionally, had succeeded in giving as much freedom to subject races as had ever been given by its opponents. ["Hear, hear!"] So long as the Government pursued the policy of seeking with other Powers to remove the shackles of tyranny from those races subject to the rule of the Turk, he felt, as a lover of freedom and liberty throughout the world, that he could conscientiously give them his support. [*Cheers.*]

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) did not think anyone would desire to deny the hon. and gallant Gentleman's claim to be a lover of freedom, and he hoped the tone which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had adopted might be pursued throughout the Debate. He remembered the Debates of 1878-80, and he believed that infinite mischief was done by the extreme degree of Party heat which entered into the discussions of that time. No one desired to charge hon. Gentlemen opposite with callousness in regard to the indescribable horrors contained in the Armenian Blue-books; and they must feel that those horrors were by no means ended. The last Blue-book dealing with the Armenian Question which he had read contained an account of how 30 Druse women were killed fighting against the Turks. The reason why those women forgot their sex was apparent in the descriptions of the horrors to which the Christian inhabitants of that country were subjected at the hands of the Turks; and in those descriptions also were to be found the key to the true meaning of the action of Greece and in the refusal of the Cretans to pay any heed to the promises of autonomy made to them by the Great Powers. ["Hear, hear!"] No one could deny that Lord Salisbury desired to put an end to those horrors. He would be the last to ascribe malevolence or want of decent feeling to the noble Lord, who, so far as he knew, was as humane a Gentleman as any Member of the House. But what made them wince when they thought of the position of affairs in the East was the absolute failure of this country to secure the object it had in view. He was convinced from his reading of the Blue Books that Lord Salisbury had done everything in his power to induce the Powers to join in doing the only thing that would have any effect on the Turk—that was, to use force or to make it absolutely certain that if necessary sufficient force would be used to compel the Turk to submit. Lord Salisbury was unsuccessful in that policy; but he did not suppose that the noble Lord was unsuccessful because of any selfishness on the part of this country. He hoped that when all that had taken place was revealed it would be proved that this country had said in the Concert of Europe: "However we value our traditional interest in the Mediterranean and our influence there, we are not going to purchase any advantage for ourselves at the price of subjecting to unspeakable miseries millions of persons under Turkish rule." But he thought the Government ought to have seen, from the course of the negotiations in regard to Armenia, that the so-called Concert of Europe was nothing better than a group of greedy, selfish, pitiless, heartless Powers. [*Cheers.*] If ever there was an order given to them from Heaven it was that all that was best in European civilisation—all that claimed to be even akin to Christianity—ought to have inflicted punishment on the Turks for the terrible outrages they had committed; and, if there was any real desire for the progress of humanity and civilisation among those Powers, Turkey would not have been allowed to continue its despotic domination over Armenia and Crete. [*Cheers.*] His complaint against the Government was that, having seen the failure of their well-intentioned efforts in the case of Armenia, they had not realised what the real character of the Concert of Europe was, or, having realised it, that they had not acted upon it. Then came the question of Crete. Greece was, indeed, the mother country of Crete, and nothing could be more natural than the desire of the Cretans to be united with their kin on the mainland. ["Hear, hear!"] The Turks could not be got to do anything to improve the position of affairs in the island, and until Colonel Vassos landed there had been continual pillaging and fighting. The fact was that the Powers had been merely trifling in regard to the island, and had made no real effort to get Turkey to carry out the promised reforms. Then it was that Her Majesty's Government made a great mistake. They went into a combination with the Great Powers; they agreed to land troops in the island, and they came hastily to the conclusion that they would not allow Crete to pass to Greece, which, he was informed, would not have been so unacceptable even to the Mahomedan inhabitants of the island. ["Hear, hear!"] They would not suffer the union between the Greeks and the Cretans, and all these misfortunes had followed. This country lost its initiative. The blockade of Crete was a shocking thing. ["Hear, hear!"] There were many women and children and a large number of non-combatants in the interior of the island; had adequate provision been made to prevent that blockade from inflicting famine upon these people?

Mr. CURZON: It is inflicted on Mahomedans.

Sir R. REID said the Mahomedans were in the towns. What he referred to was the notification that food and supplies were not to be taken into the interior—that was to say, where the Christians were. But he did not care two straws in this controversy whether a man was a Christian or a Mahomedan. The question was, how could the blockade be justified? What had the population of Crete done to bring this blockade upon them? They had done nothing. The right hon. Gentleman had informed them on a previous occasion that the object of the blockade was to drive the Greek forces out of Crete. The first consequence of the determination not to allow the union between Crete and Greece was the blockade of Crete. Then there were the bombardments, which would not be forgotten by the people who had the honour of this country at heart. ["Hear, hear!"] The object of our Navy was not to bombard people who were endeavouring to shake off a hideous yoke, as these people were. He could not but think that we had been obliged to acquiesce in the retention of the Turkish troops in Crete, and as long as those troops remained there the insurgents would never be satisfied that they were going to have autonomy. In the case of the fragments of the Turkish Empire which had been detached, such as Bosnia, Herzegovina, or Bulgaria, where a successful autonomy had been obtained, the Ottoman troops had not been allowed to remain. ["Hear, hear!"] The retention of the Turkish troops was absolutely incompatible with autonomy. When this country was asked to join in preventing the union of Crete with Greece we ought to have said that we would not consent to make any such declaration. In 1886, when Greece was blockaded by Mr. Gladstone's Government, France refused to take part in the blockade, but France did not thereby incur the enmity of the other Powers. Great Powers like France and Great Britain would not be treated as being outside the Concert because they refused to take part in a wrong that was being done.

Captain BETHELL: We should have lost our influence.

Sir R. REID said he did not hold the power of his country as cheaply as the hon. and gallant Member seemed to do. Let them remember what had been the history of our country during the last 100 years; very often our power had been most effective without our having fired a single gun. At the time of the Holy Alliance we refused to enter upon a wrong course, and if we had done so at the present juncture we should have been regarded as friends by the Greeks, with that touching affection which they always exhibited towards those who displayed the smallest sign of kindness. In that way we should have been able to influence the Greek Government in a way which was not possible by fleets or bombardments. He did not believe the friendship and good will of this country was so cheap a thing that the Continental Powers would not willingly have made some effort to retain it. He had indicated the ground on which he thought this Vote ought certainly to be denied. He hoped they would have another and a fuller opportunity of discussing the whole subject. It was not the fault of some of them that that opportunity had not come already, but sooner or later he trusted the question would be raised in a deliberate and formal manner by the right hon. Gentleman, who unquestionably was the first man on that side of the House. He perfectly recognised that they might preserve the territorial integrity of Turkey, and yet put the subject populations in the same position as those of Bosnia, Herzegovina, or Bulgaria. But what security had the Government that this would be done? They had grave reason to fear that the word "autonomy" might be construed in such a way that the Turkish troops in Crete might be retained. He should be delighted to be corrected if he was wrong. He hoped, at all events, that the Government would adhere to the determination that the Cretans should be rescued from the dominion of the Turk, that the last Turkish soldier should leave the island, and that their autonomy should be real and not temporary. [*Cheers.*]

*The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. Curzon, Lancashire, Southport), who rose amidst Ministerial cheers, said: The hon. Member for Rushcliffe, in seconding the Motion, asked the pertinent question, "How is Great Britain acting in this international crisis, on what side are the might and influence of this country to be cast?" I shall hope to show, in the course of the remarks which it will be my duty to make, that the influence of this country has been cast, and is being cast, on the side of peace, conciliation, and moderation; aye, I will say, and of freedom—[*Ministerial cheers*]—and if we have been retarded in the realisation of that plan by the rash counsels which have elsewhere prevailed, we have not abandoned our intention, and still hope to carry it to a successful issue. The hon. and learned Member who has just sat down made what I am sure he desired to be a moderate and just speech, and in that spirit I shall endeavour to answer him. His moderation, however, did not prevent him from failing to understand our case in some of its simplest aspects, and did not save him from totally misrepresenting some of what we believe to be the elementary features of the case. I may instance before I pass to my main argument one point alone. Speaking of the Constitution given to Crete in August last year, he said that Constitution had broken down, because, on the one hand of the obstruction of the Turks, and, on the other, of the apathy of the Powers. It is inconceivable that the hon. and learned Member would have made that statement if he had carefully studied the Blue-book which has most recently been presented. I see no inherent improbability in the first part of his argument. As a matter of fact, I believe it to be untrue. I have made the most careful efforts to get to the bottom of the case, and I am bound to say that the collapse of that Constitution of August, 1896, I believe, from the record of facts presented to the House, to have been due not in the main to the obstruction of the Turks, but to intrigues from another quarter which are fully narrated in the Blue-book. Since we last debated the Cretan question three weeks have passed. That period has not, I am sorry to say, greatly affected the situation in Crete; but it has, of course, profoundly modified the situation on the mainland. I shall endeavour to put before the House a brief statement of the position in the island, and will then pass on to what the House will expect me to say something about—namely, the policy of the Government as to the mainland. First, with regard to the island of Crete. A fanciful picture has been much drawn during the past few weeks, glimpses of which I have caught in more than one speech to-night, of the present state of the island. Society in Crete has been represented to us as divided, if I may use the metaphor, into sheep and wolves. The sheep are represented as being the Cretan Christians, and the wolves as the Cretan Mahomedans, who, along with the Turks, are engaged in preying upon and devouring the innocent Christians, assisted by the forces and guns of the Powers. What are the real facts of the case? The interior of the island of Crete at the present moment is in the occupation of a large number of Cretans, who the hon. Member says are doing nothing. May I describe what the inactivity of those Cretan Christians is? These so-called insurgents are in the occupation of the villages and in the enjoyment of the possessions and crops of the unhappy Mussulmans who have been turned out. They are living a life of armed idleness, wandering up and down the mountains, exchanging shots with everybody they meet—[*laughter*]—and, I am sorry to say, killing every Mahomedan, of either sex, who falls within their reach. [*Opposition murmurs.*] I am stating nothing but what I know to be facts, which are corroborated by the evidence which will be laid later before the House. [*Opposition cries of* "When?" *and* Mr. MACNEILL: "Produce it now!"] Near the towns these Christian insurgents are engaged, in spite of the reiterated warnings which have been received by them, in attacks on the blockhouses and outposts of those positions, and in cutting off the water supply, and endeavouring to starve the populations collected within their walls. [Mr. DILLON: "You are starving them!"] Will the hon. Member allow me? These insurgents are, to a large extent, led by Greek officers, their ranks are filled by Greek volunteers, the only artillery they appear to possess are Greek cannon. In a recent interview which the Admirals had with eight of the so-called insurgent chiefs five were found to be Greek lawyers—[*Ministerial laughter*]—and the sixth was a Greek doctor. [*Renewed laughter.*] Though the Greek authorities, when appealed to with reference to their action, have disowned all responsibility for these insurgents, I have observed that there is no similar disposition to condone or disown any irregularities which are committed by the Bashi-Bazouks on the other side; and so entirely are these insurgents controlled by the influence of the Greek occupying force that an application having been made by them the other day to the Admirals for stores and relief, and those stores having been promptly placed at their disposal, they were compelled to return them unused. This is the simple population represented to us as rightly struggling to be free against the barbarous oppression of the Turks. [*Opposition cheers.*] Obviously no amount of arugument or evidence that I can produce affects the *a priori* convictions of hon. Gentlemen opposite. [*Ministerial cheers, and* Mr. MACNEILL: "Produce the evidence!"] I must ask the hon. Member to take my word for it. ["Hear, hear!"] Now I come to the point raised by the hon. and learned Member who has just spoken, that we are "bombarding and starving" these innocent people. The phrase was first used by the Leader of the Opposition when—I think in the last Debate in this House—he told us we were trying to starve and bombard the Cretans into the acceptance of autonomy. It is a good phrase, and it fell glibly from the lips of the right hon. Gentleman. But it is absolutely destitute of any foundation in fact. What are the facts about the alleged starvation caused by the blockade of which the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken is so much in dread? The reports that have been received from persons who have been moving freely about among the insurgents in the interior assure us that the canteens and eating houses are doing "a roaring trade," that food is everywhere abundant, and now that the crops are about to be gathered there will be no lack of provisions, because the Christians will not only have their own crops but those of the evicted Mussulmans as well. [*Laughter.*] These facts, which I have narrated to the House, represent a faithful picture, so far as I can depict it, of society as it at present exists in that island, and I do not think any hon. Gentleman in this House would say that it can be described as an era of pastoral innocence, or that in Crete we have any reproduction of the Saturnian age. [*Laughter.*] I next turn to what is passing in the towns, and here I must deal with the topic raised by two or three preceding speakers about the continuance of Turkish troops in the island. More than one speaker has said: "Your intentions may be excellent, your promises may be sound, but your execution is feeble." [*Opposition cheers.*] "You have expressed your desire to get rid of the Turkish troops, why not do it?" And an extraordinary and mysterious notion has sprung into existence that the

Turkish troops are being kept in Crete by the malevolent action of the majority of the Powers, that England is in favour of their removal, but that there are certain other Powers, to be named or nameless, who exercise a malignant influence in the background, behind whose chariot wheels we are content to be dragged, and who interfere with the successful realisation of our plans. These are not at all the facts of the case. May I put before the House what are the facts with regard to the coast towns and the Turkish troops in them? The principal seaports of Crete are in the occupation of the international forces. In these seaports there are next to no Christians. Either they have fled into the interior or have been deported by British and foreign ships to other shores. But these towns are packed by dense populations of Mahomedan refugees—homeless, defenceless, and with no means whatever of subsistence. Take a concrete case to make my argument clear. Take the case of Candia. It is a town in which we are principally interested, owing to the occupying force being in the main supplied by Her Majesty's troops. In Candia there are at the present moment no fewer than 50,000 Mahomedan refugees, of whom 32,000 have no connection with the locality, but come from different parts of the island, and as compared with this enormous aggregate there are only 500 Christians. These 50,000 Mahomedans are peasants who have no handicraft of their own and no means of making money, and who are only kept alive from day to day by doles of flour sent by the Sultan; who are decimated by smallpox and afflicted by a perpetual cutting off of their water supply; for it should be known that in the country outside the cordon drawn round Candia, containing this defenceless population of 50,000 Mahomedans, there are 60,000 armed Cretan insurgents ready at any moment, if the protection we afford them be withdrawn, to pounce down upon these people and to inflict upon them the utmost cruelty. How are these Mahomedans protected? There are in the town of Candia something under 1,500 European troops, and there are some 3,500 Turkish troops. The Europeans occupy the town, and the Turkish troops occupy and defend the military cordon drawn outside. Our authorities report to us that the European troops are powerless to protect both the town and cordon. How can we under these circumstances withdraw the Turkish garrison? I can only say, if we did so, it would be a prelude to massacres compared with which those of Armenia would sink into insignificance, and it would be massacre enacted under the eyes of the Powers and with our direct responsibility. [*Ministerial cheers.*] The hon. Member who preceded me spoke of sentiment as affecting this case, and he said what I am sure he felt himself and what I am equally sure is felt by most people in this House, that humanity as understood by him is not a one-sided emotion. His humanity is equally aroused by Moslem and by Christian, and suffering in any quarter appeals to him. I submit that the incontestable figures which I have put before the Committee show that in this case of Crete the question of humanity arises not only in the case of the Christians but also in the case of the Mahomedans. [*Cheers.*]

Sir R. REID: I quite agree with that. May I point out this also? There are only three possible courses. The first course is for the European Powers to defend these people; the second is to have the Turks, and the third is to have the Greeks. Either you must do it all yourselves or leave it to the tender mercies of the Turks. You refuse the Greeks: that is my argument. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. CURZON: Yes; but the Greeks are endeavouring to kill them. If, however, I may be allowed to resume my argument, I would point out that the Admirals, as is well known, were the first to recommend the withdrawal of the Turkish garrison from Crete. It was very natural they should do so, because it would greatly simplify the difficult and delicate task which has been placed on their shoulders. But even they say that this Turkish garrison, for the reasons I have named, cannot at this moment be spared. Of course the Committee must not from that draw the conclusion that the Turkish troops are to remain permanently in the island. The hon. Gentleman said he knew of no case in which autonomy had been set up in which the Turkish troops had not eventually been withdrawn. Quite true. But he failed to point out any case in which, while autonomy was being established, there was not an adequate Turkish garrison in the place. ["Hear, hear!"] We firmly hope for, and we look forward with absolute confidence to, the time when the Turkish troops will be withdrawn. ["Hear, hear!"] The Government have so often repeated their pledges on this point that I should have thought it unnecessary to emphasise them in this Debate, but I have been trying to explain to the Committee—and I hope I have succeeded — the reason why that policy, which remains exactly where it was, and from which we do not recede for one moment, is absolutely incapable of being carried into immediate execution. ["Hear, hear!"] What I have said of Candia is true also of Retimo. At Retimo the population, which before was 10,000, has been swollen by the immigration of refugees to 30,000. A census, which has been taken by the Relief Committee, of Mahomedans shows at this moment, after all that has passed, that there are in the island as many as 107,000 Mahomedans, or one-third of the total population of Crete. This is what the hon. Gentleman called a residuum, as if it was a petty tenth, or twelfth, or fifteenth, whereas it is one-third of the whole population. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member said Greece was the motherland, and that it was natural she should act on behalf of her sons in Crete. [*Cheers.*] Yes, Sir, but she has Mahomedan as well as Christian sons. [*Cheers.*] Both look to her as a mother; they are of the same race, and I cannot understand why all the maternal sympathy should be reserved for the 200,000 Christians and absolutely denied to the 107,000 Mahomedans. [*Cheers.*] I should add that out of these 107,000 Mahomedans in the island, no fewer than 67,000 are at the present moment in receipt of relief. We are told that the island of Crete is clamouring for annexation to Greece. This minority, this one-third of the population, amounting to as large a proportion as in the case of Ireland, refused the offer of Home Rule—a minority to whose views great respect was attached, at any rate by this side of the House—this minority says that under no circumstances will it accept annexaxtion to Greece, but will fight to the death or emigrate. We do not want to depopulate the island of Crete either by massacre or by emigration. [*Cheers.*] The Cretan Mahomedans are about the most stable element in the population of that country. They are sturdy peasants who are wanted for the cultivation of the village crops, and whether annexation is given or withheld, whether autonomy is granted or proves a failure, there will be no hope for the future of Crete until the passionate, embittered vendetta between these two sections of the population subsides, and the rural population are allowed to go back to live in tranquillity in the villages, while the urban population equally go back to the towns. [*Cheers.*] This is impossible while the Greek troops remain in the island. It cannot be doubted that the presence of the Greek troops in Crete is a focus of agitation and a centre of intrigue. I have often said it would be the first dawn of a brighter day for Crete if these Greek troops were withdrawn, and I hope I may be justified in drawing from the retirement of Colonel Vassos and some other Greek officers that which seems to me the natural and obvious conclusion—namely, that the troops will shortly follow in like manner. [*Cheers.*] When the Greeks have been withdrawn, it will be found possible to reduce the Turkish garrison, and then we may begin to secure some restoration of confidence and order in the island. These facts, I think, are an answer to the question which was put me by the mover of the Amendment, who was very anxious to know what was the autonomy, and why it was not being set up? Is it not obvious, in an island so hopelessly sundered as I have described, and in the disorganised condition which I have narrated, that the proposal to set up a new constitution, to convene an assembly, to appoint or elect a ruler, would at present be an act of fatuity? ["Hear, hear!"] There is one other argument I should like to deal with before I pass from Crete, and that is the argument which was adumbrated rather than followed out by the hon. Gentleman—namely, that the Powers, before the declaration of war, should have evacuated Crete, and, to use a vulgar but classical phrase, should have let the Cretans stew in their own juice. I do not think that proposal will bear examination for one moment. If, after the declaration of war between the Greeks and the Turks, England and the other Powers of Europe had withdrawn from Crete, what would have happened? In the first place, the island would have been made the cockpit of a most fratricidal struggle, for carrying out the metaphor of the hon. Member, these children of the same mother would have been cutting one another's throats, and we should have witnessed one of the most shameful warfares to which history can point. [" Hear, hear! "] Supposing that Colonel Vassos and the insurgents had prevailed, for they had the superiority in numbers, in arms, and in cannon, they would probably have succeeded in wiping out the minority, and then, when all was over, what would have happened? If there is one thing certain from the war up to this point—and I am sure I do not desire to say anything harsh about it—it is, I think, that victory has not inclined to the side of the Greeks. No telegrams from Athens, no sentiment, no partiality can blind our eyes to that fact. It is a common axiom of warfare that the spoils of war are to the conqueror, and in the readjustment that must have taken place, and that will take place after the conclusion of the war, who can believe for one moment, whatever might have been the preliminary successes of Greece in Crete, that there would not be an absolute end to autonomy and an end for ever to annexation, and that wretched, unhappy Crete would have been put once again through the furnace of her afflictions before she reverted to the dominion of the Turk? [*Cheers.*] The Concert of Europe may have many weaknesses and many faults, but at least it is innocent of the criminal responsibility that would have been entailed by any such consequence as that. [" Hear, hear! "] On that point the Powers have been absolutely unanimous from the start. They have agreed that Crete, having been taken under their protection, must so remain, and that, therefore, it must be proclaimed as neutral ground during the duration of the war. The answer to the question put to me as to the reason for maintaining the blockade is that the blockade has proved most effective in keeping out from the island arms, ammunition, and explosives, and, therefore, in mitigating the suffering and loss of life that would otherwise have ensued. [*Cheers.*] This policy the Committee may be assured, the Government and the Powers will continue to pursue. [*Cheers.*] It may take them a long time, it will certainly take a longer time than was originally expected, but I am sure the worst advice anybody could give in the interest of Crete would be that, having taken it in hand, they should now desist. [" Hear, hear! "] I hope the facts which I have stated will avail somewhat to explain the situation in Crete. [*Cheers.*] It is surely time that we passed out of the world of fiction, and that our footsteps were directed only in the paths of truth and common sense. [*Cheers.*] It would really seem as if Crete had never passed out of the mythic age. [*Cheers.*] In a previous debate I remember having to expose no less than 12 fables which had grown up in the course of this crisis. [" Hear, hear! "] The latest crop has, I think, not been the least fanciful. I have already exposed this evening the starvation fable which has played so prominent a part in the platform polemics of hon. Gentlemen opposite; and now there are two more fables which, before I pass from the question of Crete, I must be allowed respectfully to upset. [" Hear, hear! " *and Opposition laughter.*] The first is the fable which played so large a part in the questions which used to be put to me a fortnight ago, and which appeared in the statement issued by Colonel Vassos—that the Mussulmans who had been relieved from their beleaguered positions at Selino and Candano had been armed by the Turks at Canea and sent out to work their wicked will on the Christians. An international Commission was appointed to inquire into this allegation, and they found that there was absolutely no foundation for the statement at all. [*Cheers.*] They were put in possession of the certificates, signed by the insurgent chiefs to whom the arms had been handed over, and they found further that the Turks could not have distributed any more arms for the simple reason that they had none to distribute. [*Laughter and cheers.*] The only arms distributed since February in Canea have been some which were issued at the end of that month to private persons in the town for enrolling a sort of special gendarmerie to assist in the maintenance of order. These arms have since been withdrawn. [" Hear,

hear!"] The third fable which, in the interests of truth, I feel bound to expose is one relating to the Turkish soldiers. An impression undoubtedly very widely exists that the Turkish soldiers in Crete are with difficulty restrained from committing horrible acts. I assure the House I am not concerned to defend Turkish soldiers or Greek soldiers. I have no feeling one way or the other. My only desire is to see justice done between the two and to correct any particularly unfair representations that may be about. An hon. Member who preceded me brought forward certain cases of misbehaviour on the part of the Turkish troops last year. When these cases are quoted, I think it only fair as regards the present crisis to quote the testimony of the British Admiral, which is to this effect:—

> "The Turkish troops have behaved admirably, but religious fanaticism may possibly upset the great integrity which all other provocations have hitherto failed to do. Their conduct deserves their being treated as disciplined troops in this respect second to none of the European nations."

[*Cheers.*] I pass now to the question of the mainland. I do not desire in what I say to discuss the question as to who was the aggressor in this unhappy war. That seems to me to have become almost an academic question and to lack any immediate interest. I think few people can have any doubt on which side the provocation lay—[*cheers*]—but the rashness that lay behind that provocation has been so fearfully and terribly chastised that I think it is unnecessary to say anything more about it. But there is one charge I must meet because it has been repeated to-night, and that is the charge that the Concert of Europe is responsible for the war between Turkey and Greece. [*Opposition cheers.*] I cannot imagine how any hon. Member who has made an honest study of the facts can use so childish an argument as that. [*Cheers.*] What are the facts of the case? The Concert informed Greece that she would not be allowed to annex Crete; that Crete had become by their action a European concern. Thereupon Greece, because she could not get her way in Crete, massed a great number of her troops on the northern frontier, sent large bodies of irregulars forward to attack the Turks and then, when, after great provocation, and, I must say, a considerable display of patience—[*cheers*]—the Turks accepted the challenge and declared war, the friends of Greece turn round and said, "It is all the fault of the European Concert." [*Laughter.*] If the defence of Greece is that she is not responsible for the Ethnike Hetairia, then *a fortiori* the Concert must be still less responsible for the action of that body. But really such logic deceives nobody. Everybody knows perfectly well what the massing of those troops on the frontier meant. We were not obscurely told day after day in the columns of the newspapers that represent the Hellenic cause. Everyone knew that those troops were being collected there and that their presence could only mean war. Calamitous as the results of the war have been, I protest I cannot understand the method of reasoning by which anybody arrives at the conclusion that the responsibility rests on any shoulders but one. So far from the Powers being responsible, I should be prepared to argue that they have carried conciliation and consideration in the case of Greece almost to the point of weakness. They were told that if Greece were blockaded, following the example of right hon. Gentlemen opposite 11 years ago—[*loud cheers*]—war would infallibly result, and they desisted, therefore, from that step. They used every means, by representations, by provisions for keeping the combatants apart, and by declarations that the aggressor would not be allowed to profit by his aggression, to postpone the struggle; and, if they failed in the result, at any rate let the blame not rest on their shoulders. But, if they have not prevented war, has not something been done in limiting the area of that war—[*cheers*]—in localising the disturbances, and in preventing the infinitely greater and more serious danger of a European conflagration? [*Cheers.*] The hon. Member who moved this Motion was quite angry because when we speak of a European war we mean a war in which many European nations are involved, and he said that the claim of the Concert had been to prevent war of any kind. What they did undertake to do was, not to prevent the passion or rashness of Greece from plunging her into hostilities with Turkey, but what they did undertake, and what they have succeeded in doing, was to keep the peace in the eastern part of Europe. ["Hear, hear!"] I venture to say that that success constitutes an incalculable, and will be regarded as a historic, service in the history of European politics. [*Cheers.*] Now we come to the present situation. The Powers have been prepared to intervene, and are even now intervening to settle this disastrous struggle. [*General cheers.*] Lord Rosebery said, in 1886:—

> "No sane friend of Greece would wish that she should embark in war with one of the great military Powers of the world, even if she had a good cause to fight for."

It is a pity that there have not been more sane friends of Greece about. [*Cheers.*] It is a pity that there have not been more followers of Lord Rosebery—[*loud cheers and Opposition laughter*]—to repeat the words of that wise and experienced statesman in this House. The Powers have expressed their willingness to mediate, if Greece on her part will express her willingness to listen to their opinions. That is the general attitude of the Powers at this moment. I have no right, in my subordinate position, to commit any other Power or Government except our own, but that is the tenor of the negotiations which are proceeding at this moment. Her Majesty's Government desire, in common with their allies, to preserve the Greek kingdom. They sympathise with the development within due limits of the Hellenic instinct, but they are convinced—and the experience of the war adds to their conviction—that the interests of Greece lie, not in war or in expansion or in conquest, still less in defeat—[*cheers*]—but that they lie in the path of peaceful consolidation of her resources. [*Cheers.*] It is very easy to abuse the Powers, but I venture to say that the attitude taken up, and the words that are spoken by many hon. Gentlemen in this House, do not render the task of the Government more easy. [*Cheers.*] It is very easy to denounce the Concert of Europe. Any platform spouter can do that. [*Laughter and cheers.*] It is always easier to attack a Committee, the opinion emanating from whom is a corporate opinion, and the consequences of their action, than an individual; but is it politic, I ask, is it just, and is it wise? [*Cheers.*] If you had an alternative I could understand it. Denounce the Concert if you have something to set up in their place, but you come here barren of any policy—with your mouths full of denunciation and your brains empty of suggestion. [*Loud cheers and Opposition laughter.*]

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): That is very superior.

*MR. CURZON: I hope the hon. Gentleman will curb his irregularity and allow me to proceed. [*Opposition laughter.*] I venture to ask the Committee what is the good of denouncing the three Emperors, and what is the good of accusing us of being dragged at the heels of the despotic Powers of Europe? Supposing you were to take our places to-morrow or next week! I remember an occasion when a Liberal Ministry commenced its tenure of office by an apology to Austria. [*Cheers.*] If you came into power now, your first act would be an apology to Germany and to Russia. You may be sure that the more you abuse the Concert, and the more you attack the Sovereigns who constitute a portion of that Concert, the more you alienate the allies of this country, the more you render it difficult for this Government to get what it is anxious to get—namely, good terms for Greece—and the more you jeopardise the chances of a peaceful settlement. [*Cheers.*] I should like to conclude by a reference to what fell from the hon. Member for Rushcliffe. He pointed out, I think, with great force that there is really a wider question at stake than the mere defeat of one army or the victory of another, or the mere triumph of one cause over another. The real Eastern question is not simply a question of the victory or the defeat of Greece in this struggle. The real Eastern question is the better government of the peoples of the East—[*general cheers*]—the gradual widening of their liberties, the securing of proper guarantees for the prosperity of that autonomy which some of them have already secured, and which we hope will be extended to others in the future. [*Cheers.*] Those results are no doubt only arrived at by slow degrees. An hon. Member who spoke to-night seemed to doubt whether they would ever be attained. Surely the history of Egypt, of Bulgaria, of Rumelia, of Servia, and of Rumania is in itself a proof that the wider interests of the populations of the East have not been lost sight of by the Great European Powers. It is not a question of Crete alone. I quite agree that Crete is part of a much wider and bigger question in which Armenia plays no unimportant part. I confess I am shocked and distressed when I hear hon. Gentlemen opposite say that the Concert of Europe has abandoned Armenia to its fate. It is an unjust, and I may even say a shameful, misrepresentation. [*Cheers.*] No one who reads the Blue-book which brought the narrative of Eastern affairs up to October last year can fail to have seen that in that month Lord Salisbury had united the Powers on the principle of reforms, not for Armenia or Crete only, but for the provinces of the Turkish Empire, and on the principle of the application of coercion to the Sultan to carry out those reforms. Then came this Cretan trouble, and no doubt the ambitions of Greece have for the moment put the sufferings of Armenia into the background. But there has been no desertion, no abandonment; the question of Armenia and our interest in Armenia remains where it did before. If anything is to be done for Armenia or Crete, or for any one of the subject populations who have engaged the interest of everyone on both sides of the House, it must be patent now that it cannot be done by one Power alone. Isolation cannot effect anything in this matter. It can only be done by this or by any other Government acting in friendly co-operation with its allies. Neither personal ambition nor the desire of aggrandisement on the part of any individual State ought to be allowed to interfere with that desire. That is the policy which the Government have set before themselves consistently, and according to which they have hitherto acted; and when these storms have passed away I am convinced it will be found that it has been successful and has been supported by the common sense of the country. [*Cheers.*]

Sir HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said the right hon. Gentleman had made what everyone who heard it would agree was a most remarkable speech. [*Cheers.*] It was a remarkable utterance to be made by any Member of the House speaking on behalf of the Government and representing a department which, surely, in the management of its affairs required delicacy of touch and expression beyond all other qualities. The right hon. Gentleman had departed from that dispassionate and fair spirit—[*Ministerial cries of* "No, no!" *and cheers*]—in dealing with the contentions which prevailed in the East of Europe which ought to have characterised his utterance. [*Ministerial cries of* "No!" *and* "How?"] This was the fourth or fifth occasion on which this Eastern question had been discussed in the House; but it had never been discussed with fulness and completeness, and could not now be discussed, because the Government had not seen fit to give the House all the information which he and his hon. Friends thought it was necessary to have. [*Opposition cheers.*] He doubted whether there had been a case in which the country had been kept to so great an extent in the dark as to what was being said in its name. [*Opposition cheers.*] They knew something of what had been done in its name; they knew that our ships were sent to Cretan waters, that our shells were fired, and that our forces were landed. But of the inner reasons, the hesitation, controversies, and decisions which led to those events the House and the country had been kept for the main part in ignorance. It was, therefore, difficult to discuss the part the Government might have played, because they did not know exactly what that part was. Take even the case of the instructions to the Admirals. The Admirals had been invested with extraordinary discretionary powers, but when they asked that the nature of those instructions should be communicated to the House they were met with a refusal, although on similar occasions before the request had been granted. The Government had wrapped themselves in the Concert of Europe as a mantle, and there was no profane person among them to lift even a fold of that august garment. [*Laughter.*] On the previous day an occasion arose when they formed the expectation of receiving further information. The Prime Minister was announced to address a great meeting of his followers in London. What did they receive instead of the information they desired? They had an exhibition of that cynical rhetoric and of those reckless jibes—[*Ministerial cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—they were accustomed to from the Prime Minister, but no detailed information was forthcoming. On the other hand, there was a revelation which was almost equally important of the spirit in which Lord Salisbury at least regarded those great events. If this was the spirit which really guided our policy he thought they might despair of the credit and fair name of England. [*Opposition cheers.*] They must hope, however—and their past experience justified them in the hope—that when the Dispatches of the Foreign Minister came to be seen they would be found to breathe a different spirit, and to show at least some outward consideration for that cause of freedom and humanity to which the history of this country had always been devoted. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman had given an explanation of his view of the situation in Crete and in Greece. He was not going to inquire who was to blame for the lamentable struggle now going on in Greece. [*Ironical laughter.*] Hon. Members opposite assumed that Greece was the main culprit. ["Hear, hear!"] He wished to put that question aside for other times, when they would be able to judge of it. Whether Greece had acted wisely or foolishly, she had at least acted in a plucky and patriotic spirit. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh, oh!" *and cheers.*] She had put her fortune to the touch against her hereditary enemy; and he believed that among her people who were best informed there had been no great illusion as to the probable result. However it might detract from her wisdom in a worldly point of view, it did not detract from the honourable character of the struggle. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Powers were intervening. The universal voice of civilisation asked that that intervention should be speedy and effectual, and he was glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he appreciated the situation. It appeared to him that the conflict in which the two Powers were engaged partook much more of the character of what was known as an affair of honour than a regular affair of war; and so soon as the point of honour was satisfied, the struggle should be stopped. He hoped that no pedantries of etiquette would be allowed to stand in the way of any intervention which the Powers wished to make. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman said that the Cretans in the hill country were going about killing Mahomedans, that they were idling their time with guns in their hands. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to imply any doubt as to the genuine character of the Cretan movement for freedom? Did he imply that these idling men were playing at being insurgents, and had not a stern purpose in their hearts? Then why was he, as a subordinate agent and mouthpiece of Europe, so anxious to give the Cretans autonomy? If the right hon. Gentleman's argument was good against anything, it was good against autonomy itself. ["Hear, hear!"] Then the right hon. Gentleman said that the Cretans were not only idle and mischievous, but that they were extremely well off for food. How had this blockade been so ineffective that it had not prevented the object which it was intended to prevent? The right hon. Gentleman said that the Turkish troops must be maintained in Crete in order to secure the safety of the Mahomedans in the towns, who were beset at this moment by a larger number of Christian fighting men than the population of the island. [*Laughter.*] But, whether this be so or not, the Turkish troops were to be retained for that purpose, and the Greek troops were to be withdrawn. He assumed that the Government were giving autonomy to the Cretans, and that they believed the Cretans were right in wishing to escape from the misgovernment of Turkey. If that was so, he asked the right hon. Gentleman to put himself in the position of a Cretan at this moment. A Cretan in the mountains knew very little of the Powers and about the negotiations going on; he was also happy enough to know nothing of the Debates in the House of Commons. [*Laughter.*] He did not receive a morning and evening paper at his door; but the one thing he knew was that so long as the Greek soldiers remained and the Greek flag flew there was some chance of redemption, and that the moment they disappeared, and the Turkish soldiers remained, he came to the conclusion that sooner or later, the grip of the Turkish power being upon him, he would be put back. ["Hear, hear!"] He believed that most impartial minds would consider that, whether autonomy or annexation to Greece was intended, the first thing to be done was to withdraw the troops, the outward and visible sign of Turkish power, from Crete. The right hon. Gentleman said that that could not be done because the troops were there to do police work—to protect life and preserve order. But the Powers had taken Crete under their protection and had landed forces there, and surely those forces might be utilised for preserving order. ["Hear, hear!"] The Leader of the House on a recent occasion had summed up the policy of the Government epigrammatically by saying that it was to secure freedom for Crete and peace for Europe. They certainly had not yet secured freedom for Crete—the circumstances were perhaps even less hopeful than before—and it could not be said that they had preserved the Continent of Europe from war. The ineffectiveness of their policy was probably due to their being the slaves of two phrases—namely, "the integrity of the Turkish Empire" and "the Concert of Europe." Of a phrase it might be said as of fire—that it was a good servant but a bad master. It might often be useful to embody a policy in a phrase, but to exaggerate the importance of the phrase and to set it up as an object almost of worship was likely to lead to error. What was meant by practical men when they spoke of the necessity of preserving the integrity of the Turkish Empire? They meant that, in the event of the dissolution—a not distant event as most people thought, whether friends or foes—of the Turkish Empire, antagonism would be occasioned in the Balkan Peninsula between Russia and Austria, who would have Germany behind her, and that this antagonism might lead to a disastrous war which would disturb the equilibrium of Europe. He admitted that if those deplorable results might follow it was desirable to postpone as long as possible the contingency that would lead to them. But was it not obvious that side by side with this policy of maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire they must have the other policy of enforcing reforms upon the Porte—["hear, hear!"]—and that by proclaiming, as the Concert of Europe was doing, the sacrosanctity of the dogma of the integrity of the Turkish Empire the Powers were depriving themselves of the strongest weapon at their disposal for securing reforms? If annexation to Greece was desired by the great bulk of the inhabitants of Crete, and if it was the shortest and easiest method of disposing of this difficulty, why should it be refused, and who could object? Could anybody doubt that that course would have been agreed to before this if it had not been for this doctrine of the integrity of the Turkish Empire, which had become almost a superstition? Hampering as this doctrine was, it apparently was not sufficiently so to satisfy the Prime Minister, who traced our duty to preserve Turkey to treaty obligations. "We are bound," he said at the Albert Hall, "to uphold Turkey irrespectively of good or bad government." Lord Salisbury turned matters of international convenience into binding obligations, and his theory seemed to be that all the Powers were bound to fulfil those obligations except the one Power for whose preservation they were entered into. That Power, apparently, might do what it liked. The doctrine propounded by the Prime Minister would be repudiated by the people of this country—["hear, hear!"]—and was only likely to find acceptance among diplomatic pedants and lovers of paradox. Where was the application of the doctrine of the integrity of the Turkish Empire to stop? Supposing that the Sultan were to give a looser rein to fanaticism and the spirit of misgovernment, supposing that massacres became not intermittent, but constant, was this country still to kneel before that doctrine? Could not any misgovernment by the Turk modify our obligations? The other phrase to which the Government were slaves was the "Concert of Europe." This was, perhaps, an even more august phrase. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had rebuked the Opposition for speaking disrespectfully of the Concert of Europe; but he was not aware that anyone had spoken disrespectfully of the several Powers who formed the Concert. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] The Concert was always spoken of by the Government as if there was no hope outside it, as if there must be an open quarrel with our neighbours if we should differ from it, and as if we should be left in isolated impotence if we were shut out of it. To all that he would reply in a word used the other night by a Minister of the Crown—"Nonsense."

[*Laughter.*] The Concert of Europe was not only admissible, but admirable on the hypothesis that the object of all its Members was the same. [" Hear, hear ! "] It was an admirable instrument, provided it meant co-operation, consultation, and mutual advice. What he objected to was that this country should be led into a fixed, cast-iron partnership which hampered and fettered its freedom of action. If we entered into any such close alliance we ought at least to be very fastidious about the partners whom we joined. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had told them on a previous occasion that the removal of the Turkish troops from Crete was objected to by the majority of the Powers. He would like to have a little more information on this point.

*MR. CURZON: On the occasion referred to what I said was that the majority of the Powers were of opinion that the Greek troops ought to go first. [" Hear, hear ! "]

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that the fact that a majority thought that the Greeks ought to go first involved the result that there was a minority who thought they ought not to go first. [" Hear, hear ! "] If there was to be a majority and a minority in this matter, it was perfectly obvious, from the slightest consideration of the circumstances, that England must in many cases be in the minority. He believed this was a point upon which the people of this country were exceedingly uneasy, and justly so. They did not like the notion of our being obliged to follow the lead and accept the *dicta* of the three Emperors in the East of Europe. [" Hear, hear ! "] Against those three Great Powers it was not necessary to say a word, and he did not wish to speak in a manner in the slightest degree derogatory of any of them; but it was a matter of common knowledge that in these matters affecting the securing of freedom to a people there could be no community of sentiment between them and us. [" Hear, hear ! "] One of these Great Powers had not the very slightest semblance or trace of representative institutions. Another, Germany, was a military absolutism in which, although there were representative bodies, they were debarred from any interference in foreign affairs, and the foreign affairs of that country were guided in a spirit which in this country was extinguished 2½ centuries ago. [" Hear, hear ! "] When he turned to the third Power, Austria, it was true that there was very much more of individual liberty in ordinary life there, but even in Austria there was no such thing as organised public opinion such as people in this country were accustomed to, and therefore the direction of foreign affairs was left entirely in the hands of their most enlightened Emperor and those who advised him. And when he turned to France and Italy, democratic, progressive, and freedom-loving as they were, he found their Governments, unfortunately for us, although it might be for excellent reasons of State policy, had tied themselves to certain of the other Powers in a way which prevented them from giving any expression to the generous feelings and impulses of the French and Italian people. Could it be wondered at that there was uneasiness amid such surroundings, or that people should wonder whether any freedom of action at all was retained for England? [" Hear, hear ! "] They repudiated the idea of any extraordinary sanctity attaching to the Concert of Europe. They were quite willing this country should take part in it on ordinary reasonable terms, but they wished to know what freedom of action there was. There had been no indication of freedom of action in the course of these Debates. People read that the Government objected to the blockade, and that their objection carried the day. That was satisfactory so far; but, looking back on it in the light of recent events, one might well ask, was that little outburst, after all, justified in a Minister who had shown himself to acquiesce in much more severe measures? [" Hear, hear ! "] The right hon. Gentleman yesterday gave the House very little information in answer to a question regarding the removal of the Turkish troops; but he was also asked a question as to the scheme of autonomy. The House would like to know a little more about that. What they wished to ask was not so much whether it had been promulgated and accepted by the Cretans, but whether it had been framed? ["Hear, hear ! "] To create a new Constitution for such a country was a very serious matter. It would have to be edited and re-edited if it was to represent the ideas and views of the six Powers and their emissaries and advisers. There were, first of all, the six Admirals on the spot, who had large discretionary powers, and great knowledge of the situation. They would be advised by the six Consuls, who were keeping them straight. Then the proposals of the six Admirals would have to go to the six Ambassadors at Constantinople, and be put into shape by them; and, finally, their proposals would be sent to be received or rejected by six Ministers in the six capitals. Thus 24 minds would be brought to bear on the scheme. [" Hear, hear! "] That was a terribly long process in itself, but it was made longer by the fact that one dozen of them differed from the other dozen fundamentally in the first conceptions of freedom and autonomy. [" Hear, hear! "] What was the alternative policy? It would—or he was entirely misinformed by the history of the past, or at all events by the records of the immediate past—have given satisfaction. It would have been to do as the people in whose interests Europe was acting desired—to hand over the island to Greece. [" Hear, hear! "] What individual Power could be injured by that? The Turk would lose the island anyway. Austria would not be injured, because Russia would get nothing, and similarly Russia would not be injured, and the Western Mediterranean Powers would all be in favour of it. But the Concert of Europe in its wisdom decided otherwise, and this country had submissively to accept that decision, and thus, reviewing the whole series of events, he could find nothing but humiliation—[" hear, hear! "]—humiliation to the diplomatic system of Europe which with such immense opportunities had achieved nothing but anger, war, and disappointment; and humiliation in a far greater degree to the people of this country whose name and power was being used at once against good sense and freedom and humanity. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. T. W. LEGH (Lancashire, Newton) said that the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken professed to be much exercised in his mind as to what was meant by the integrity of the Turkish empire. There were only two Gentlemen he could think of at the present moment—and one of them was prevented by the fortunes of war from being present—[*laughter*]—who attached to the phrase a different meaning to that which was accepted by the rest of the world. He took it that the phrase now meant something very different to what it meant 20, 30, or 40 years ago. At the present moment it amounted to little more than a diplomatic fiction—a phrase coined for the purpose of legalising the peaceful appropriation of Turkish territory by other people. [" Hear, hear! "] Under the protection of this phrase valuable provinces had been taken away from the Turk, and the only privilege he had retained over them was a nominal suzerainty and the right to a tribute, which in no instance was ever paid. What was really meant by the phrase which so disturbed hon. Gentlemen opposite was that no Power was to take any advantage of another Power by seizing territory, so to speak, out of its turn. [" Hear, hear! "] They had heard a great deal about autonomy in the course of the debate, and the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had asked for details of the proposed scheme for Crete. In his opinion it would be a great mistake to enter into the details of that plan. If details were promised by his right hon. Friend, they would have right hon. Gentlemen coming down and moving the adjournment of the House on the ground that a proper scheme of parish councils had not been provided. [" Hear, hear! "] It had always been represented that the Cretans did not want autonomy. Only as late as last November M. Delyanni expressed himself in these words; he said:—

> " Although the aspirations of the Cretans have not been fulfilled, a government has been accorded them which constitutes a tolerable form of autonomy."

Again, in the course of a debate in the Greek Chamber on December 1, M. Delyanni, who was more responsible than anybody else for the present position of affairs, said that—

> " since 1867, when he was accredited to the Emperor Napoleon III., he was convinced that the autonomy of Crete was the object to be sought for";

and he went on to say that—

> " the officers who deserted to Crete did no good there, and their conduct was a bad example. Their duty lay there, and not in Crete."

That was good evidence as to whether autonomy was of value or not. On December 7 there was a debate in the

Greek Chamber, and M. Limbriti, a well-known member of the Cretan Committee, spoke to the effect that the Cretans did not ask for union with Greece, but only for an improvement in their condition. The subscriptions which came in from the Greeks of Egypt were most valuable, but the aid of the officers who went to Crete was the reverse. What would be thought of the sincerity of the Greek Government, considering the course pursued by M. Delyanni and his colleagues? Hon. Members opposite had reiterated their sympathy with the Greeks in this most unfortunate moment. For his part, he felt pity for them, but he could not feel much sympathy for their action. Everybody foresaw what was going to take place except the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean. He was afraid the right hon. Gentleman's reputation as a military critic was likely to suffer severely, because on another occasion he prophesied disaster to the British troops in Egypt. Everybody except the right hon. Gentleman prophesied disaster to the Greek army, and disaster had come. The question now was, how were they going to be extricated? What would happen to any other Power in the like circumstances? Most undoubtedly they would be called upon to pay a heavy indemnity, and in all probability they would be obliged to surrender a large portion of their territory. Whenever it was a question affecting the Turks the matter was looked upon from a different point of view, and, whatever advantage the Turks obtained over the Greeks in the field, he did not believe they would be allowed to reap any benefit from it. Perhaps the most extraordinary assertion of all was that the Concert of Europe was responsible for this war. Suppose we had withdrawn from the Concert, who would have followed our example? The only result would have been that Crete would have been more firmly united than ever to the Turkish empire. The right hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs was very reluctant to act with the Concert, because he considered, apparently, that the form of government of some States which belonged to the Concert was not democratic enough. He ventured to say that our relations with despotisms were at least as good as our relations with Republicans. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were very bold in their assertions as to the feeling which the Government's course of action had produced in the country. For his part, he was rather sorry that the opportunity was not taken, say, at Crewe, of testing popular opinion in relation to the policy of the Government on the Eastern Question. At all events, he was convinced that all who attached value to the extreme importance of maintaining the peace of Europe, could not do otherwise than support the action and do everything in their power to maintain the action taken by the Government.

Mr. EDWARD MORTON (Devonport) could not understand how the Under Secretary made out that at present there were 60,000 Christians under arms round Candia besieging the Mahomedan population in that town, seeing that according to the latest Blue Book the total number of Christian families in Crete all told was under 50,000. When the right hon. Gentleman said the people of Crete ought to remain quiet and trustful under the promises made to them by the Concert, he would call to his mind the fact that the people of Crete had been rebelling about every ten years ever since the freedom of Greece was originally secured, and that on every occasion promises had been made to them by the Great Powers, and on every occasion those promises had been broken. And all along the demand made by the people of Crete had been a demand for annexation to Greece and not for autonomy. He remembered his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester in 1868 moving a Resolution in favour of the annexation of Crete to Greece. The insurrection in the island was then allayed owing to the promise of reforms which were never put into practice. So it was ten years later, and again in 1889, but the reforms were never carried out, owing to the bad faith of the Porte. Were not the Cretans now acting only in accordance with common sense in refusing to believe in the promises made to them? The Powers said they were going to give freedom and autonomy to Crete, but had they the power to carry it into effect? The experience of last year showed them that the Concert of Europe was controlled by two despotic Powers. If they wanted to do what was right he did not believe their Russian and German masters would allow them. The Concert of Europe had been the negation of international law. Hon. Members talked in the House and in the country as if the Concert of the six Powers constituted international law; he contended that it constituted the negation of that law. The only claim of the six Powers was that they had force behind them. It was a substitution of might for right. The Under Secretary told them that his Government and the Concert of Europe had given a Constitution to Crete. They had given a Constitution to Crete some eight different times, and it had never been realised. Why the reforms had not been carried out had never been explained yet. They had asked over and over again why this Constitution was not put in force in Crete, and they were first told that the difficulty in the way was the presence of the Greek troops. Next they were told that simultaneously on the withdrawal of the Greek troops the Turkish troops would go. They were next told that the Greeks must go first; and now, finally, they were only told that, if the Greek troops withdrew then the Turkish garrisons would be reduced. This seemed to be a programme in the wrong direction. What was the Power in the Concert which was preventing the Constitution for Crete being carried into law? The Concert was probably the strongest that ever existed in the history of the world. While it was so strong, it had been shown to be so evil. If they had decided that autonomy was to be given to Crete, and if that was not given, that showed that there was some Power which prevented it being given. When they asked a question on this subject in that House they were told by the Under Secretary that the Government had no information, and, therefore, they had to go elsewhere for information. It seemed to him that they were degraded to this position, that whereas England was in possession of no veto, Germany and Russia held a veto. We had none upon them. [*Cheers.*] He should like to know whether the Government were going to vouchsafe any information as to what it is going to do in the future? The Greeks, they were told, and the Turks were massed on the frontier; and they were told by Her Majesty's Government that both Powers had been informed that the aggressor would not be allowed to profit by war. Whatever else might be said about the Greek Government, it had not influenced the secret societies; and this was also clear, that, according to international law, the Power which had declared war was Turkey. He believed the country would hold the Government responsible for carrying out their pledge—that whoever might be the aggressor it would not profit by this war. Besides, the territory in Epirus and under the Berlin Treaty 20 years ago—this territory was given to Greece. They were entitled to say as against Her Majesty's Government, that the traditional policy of this country, with regard to insurgents struggling against foreign despots, had not been carried out on this occasion. When they were attempting, 20 years ago, or their predecessors were carrying out a similar policy, they were warned by the predecessors of those now on the Opposition Benches. He believed—for they remembered the incident at Crewe—that the same Nemesis which tracked the Beaconsfield Government would follow on the track of the present Government. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. EDWARD MOON (St. Pancras, N.) said that the hon. Member's doctrine of nationalities would have the strangest result if applied to the Transvaal. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member claimed that no sooner did Mr. Gladstone's Administration come into power than there was an enlargement of the Greek frontier. That was consequent on the Treaty of Berlin, and if the hon. Member had referred to the protocols, he would have found that Lord Salisbury asked that the Greek representatives might appear before the Berlin Congress and be heard. It had been said that if Russia had been allowed to act under the Treaty of San Stefano there would have been no Armenian massacres. But he challenged any hon. Member to point out massacres which had occurred in any part of the territory proposed to be taken by Russia under the Treaty of San Stefano.

MR. MORTON said that two of the places where the worst of the massacres occurred—the town of Bayazid and the Valley of Alashkeid—would have fallen into the hands of Russia, and Lord Beaconsfield boasted that he had succeeded in taking those two places out of the hands of Russia.

Mr. MOON said that, at any rate, those were but a small part of the massacres which had taken place, and the places referred to by the hon. Member were but a very small portion of the territory of which Russia was deprived by the Treaty of Berlin. The phrase, "integrity of the Ottoman Empire," had been a good deal commented on; but the fact that Lord Salisbury had referred to the Treaty of Berlin and the Treaty of Paris in one breath, showed that the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was not a thing which, in his opinion, could not be modified by agreement among the Great Powers. It was one of the merits of Lord Salisbury's Government that they had made that agreement a more perfect instrument for good. As M. Hanotaux had said at the time of the Armenian massacres, the Concert only existed on paper, it was a word; and that it had now become a fact was due to no one more than to Lord Salisbury. The hon. Member had said that the Balkan States had always been united against Turkey. History showed that many a time those States, when oppressed by Russia, had wished the Turks back again.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he must condole with the Members of the Opposition on the dull character of the Debate. The hon. Member for Devonport, in a speech in the provinces, had said that he and Sir William Harcourt were going to smash up the Concert. He said there—

> "the Liberal Party were anxious to destroy the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and he was anxious and willing to smash the Concert of Europe."

Mr. MORTON said that he was referring to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, from which he was quoting.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said that he was condoling with the hon. Member on the absence of that tremendous onslaught on Her Majesty's Government which would result in the smashing up of the Concert. He himself was not fond of the Concert, and he was always glad when England stood outside, because he feared her being used for ends which were not English. But on this occasion he was unable to see what other course could have been pursued than to act with the Concert. The attacks made by the right hon. Member for Stirling on every individual Power were entirely undeserved. It was a cardinal principle of French policy to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and, as had been pointed out by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for the sake of European peace it was necessary to maintain the territorial integrity of Turkey. Not much had been said about Greece in the course of the Debate. Not one of the hundred Members who signed the ridiculous and insane telegram to Greece had announced his intention of joining the fighting; and the one hon. Member who had gone within reach of bullets had been treated with jeers which were not deserved. The Greeks were to prove themselves worthy descendants of their ancestors; and they had not even been able to get up a fight on the Græco-Turkish frontier. When the Turks came within less than 3,000 yards, away went the Greeks; and the greatest loss of life had been on the occasion when 500 Greeks were trampled to death by their own brethren in headlong flight. The Greeks had been thoroughly beaten, and the Turks were now in occupation up to their old frontier line. He hoped that the Concert would not intervene to rob the Turks now of their well-earned fruits of victory. The Turks had a right to an indemnity, to a retrocession of territory, and, above all, to the assumption by Greece of that portion of the debt which she was to assume when she took over Thessaly. It would be monstrous, and it would not be without danger, if at this moment, when the Turks were victorious, Europe should intervene to rob Turkey of the fruits of the war she had waged. Within the last fortnight hon. Members opposite had learned that the Turk was not the monster he was painted, that he was brave in battle and mild in victory—[*cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—that he was one of the best fighting men in Europe, one of the best disciplined, and one of those to be trusted to extend mercy to the conquered.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said that the Leader of the Opposition, who, as they knew, was absent through indisposition, was anxious to speak upon this question. He had therefore to ask whether the Government would be willing, if this Amendment were divided upon, to postpone the Vote provided they were allowed to make progress with other Votes of a not very contentious character. Personally he was anxious to take part in the Debate, especially after what had been said by the hon. Member for King's Lynn in respect to the telegram to the King of Greece, which he was afraid the hon. Gentleman had not even read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) understood the Leader of the Opposition did desire that there should be another opportunity of discussing the Foreign Office Vote. The Government were therefore prepared, as soon as the Amendment now before the Committee was disposed of, to postpone the Vote and make progress with other Votes. [" Hear, hear! "]

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 63; Noes, 169.—(Division List, No. 192.)

Original question again proposed.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

On the return of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, after the usual interval,

1. Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £8,485, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords."

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) said he did not take objection to any particular item of the Vote, but to the whole Vote. In the items he noticed the Department of the Lord Chancellor. Ireland had its own Lord Chancellor, and did not want to pay for an English Lord Chancellor. He had never heard that the Department of the Clerk of the Parliaments had done any service to Ireland. Then there was the Department of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod. He could not understand the retention of this official in these days, and what benefit he conferred on the three kingdoms passed his comprehension. He had a great respect for the Librarian of the House of Lords, and thought that he rendered useful services, but of what use was the Department of the Lord Great Chamberlain? His objection, however, was to the whole Vote. As an Irish representative he contended that Ireland had no interest whatever in retaining the House of Lords; in fact, it was in their interest to get rid of it as quickly as possible. It had obstructed every Irish reform, and when it could not defeat their proposals for reform it had mutilated them and rendered them practically worthless. It was a useless institution from every point of view.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: It will not be possible for the hon. Member to discuss the position of the House of Lords upon the question of the salaries of the House of Lords officers. To get rid of the House of Lords legislation would be necessary, and as the hon. Member was well aware, they could not discuss legislation on dealing with Votes in Supply.

MR. CLANCY said he would not pursue that line of argument, but even from the English point of view he would point out that the House of Lords was a useless institution, for when he intended to make an important announcement he did not do so in the House of Lords, but in the habitation of the Primrose League. Of this sum of £14,485 Ireland paid a twelfth-part, and her taxable capacity had been established by the Report of a Royal Commission to be one-twentieth. Personally he would consent to Ireland paying her fair share for every sum voted by Parliament for Imperial purposes. During the last few weeks they had been treated in that House to an exhibiton of English injustice, which compelled him, as an Irish Member, to avail himself of every opportunity to protest against the excessive taxation which England imposed upon Ireland. If the Government had said they would consider what was the best mode of redressing this grievance his position would have been different, but the Government, through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had denied the most patent facts. They had disregarded the authority of Lord Farrer and Lord Welby.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I am afraid that the manner in which the hon. Member is now discussing the subject is not relevant to the Votes in Supply.

Mr. CLANCY said his vote, and possibly the votes of other Members, would be determined by the overtaxation of Ireland in connection with these Votes in Supply. That being so, he submitted that he was entitled to discuss whether Ireland was overtaxed or not, and to argue on that basis against the Votes.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: The hon. Member is justified in protesting and dividing against this Vote or any other, but I do not think discussion can take place in Supply on the overtaxation of Ireland. That is a separate matter, which would arise in Committee of Ways and Means or on other occasions, but not in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CLANCY said he was not attempting to discuss whether Ireland was overtaxed, but he was taking the contribution of Ireland to these Votes and the Report of the Financial Relations Commission as his text.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: That cannot be discussed on the Vote for the Offices of the House of Lords.

Mr. CLANCY said he would not, of course, contest the Chairman's ruling. His principal reason for opposing this Vote—and he hoped every Irish Member would oppose it on the same ground—was not on any paltry item or whether the House of Lords was a useless institution or not, but simply on the ground that Ireland was asked to contribute to the expenses of the offices of the House of Lords in undue proportion, and a grievance of the first magnitude was inflicted on his country. [*Nationalist cheers.*]

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES compared the expenses of the offices of the House of Lords with those of the House of Commons. While the latter cost £28,000 a year, the former cost £14,400. The disproportion between the two sums, when they considered the amount of work done by the two Houses, was monstrous. ["Hear, hear!"] If the House of Commons was rightly officered to the extent of £28,000 a year, the proportion spent on the House of Lords should be £4,000. He had no desire or intention to belittle the position and functions of the House of Lords in the affairs of the State. The Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House of Lords received £4,000 a year, and though the Speaker of the House of Commons had ten times as much to do, he only received £5,000. The number of hours he attended as Speaker of the House of Lords were extremely few, and his duties were extremely few and unimportant. He had no authority over the House of Lords. He was merely an accidental person on the Woolsack. He did not, and could not, give important rulings on points of order as the Speaker of the House of Commons did. He had none of the innumerable attributes of authority which had been committed to their Speaker. If the Speaker of the House of Commons properly received £5,000 a year, they ought to consider whether the salary of the Speaker of the other House should not be reduced to £2,000. But in addition to his £4,000 as Speaker of the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor received £6,000 a year as President of the Supreme Court and the Court of Chancery, which was charged on the Consolidated Fund. In his own opinion no one who received a salary voted by the House of Commons should occupy any other position than that in respect of which the salary was voted. Otherwise he was a pluralist. But the

Lord Chancellor had a third character as Speaker in the House of Lords. In that capacity he had made serious attacks on the independence and rights of the House of Commons. He would say nothing about judicial patronage, in the exercise of which he believed the Lord Chancellor was influenced neither by fear nor affection. [*Laughter.*] But as regarded his salary as Speaker of the House of Lords, he trusted the Secretary of the Treasury would take this case of pluralism and overpayment into consideration, and that next year the result would be an amicable and reasonable arrangement between the Treasury on the one hand and the Lord Chancellor on the other for the reduction of the Vote. But for his unalterable determination to support the Government in every possible way—[*laughter*]—he would move the reduction of the Vote. If, however, any other Member would move the reduction he would support him. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. DILLON entirely agreed with the views that had been so admirably expressed by the hon. Member for Lynn Regis. He thought the salaries of the officials of the House of Lords, when compared with the salaries paid to the officers of the House of Commons, were nothing short of a public scandal, and every available opportunity ought to be taken to direct the attention of the taxpayers of the country to the outrageous waste of public money which was going on from year to year in fixing the salaries of the officials in the other Chamber. No one could pretend that the work done by the Speaker of the House of Lords was worth £4,000 a year. Again, take the case of the Librarian of the House of Lords. That gentleman was paid £800 a year, while the assistant Librarian of the House of Commons, whose qualifications were well known to every hon. Member who used the Library, who did more work in one week than the Librarian of the House of Lords did in one year, only received £600 a year as the maximum. Was it not a gross scandal that they should pay £800 a year to a man for doing practically nothing, whereas they only gave £600 a year to one of their servants for working as hard as worked any official in the whole country? He considered the Secretary to the Treasury was bound to offer some explanation for such an absurd and monstrous difference in the salaries. If the Librarian of the House of Lords was to be paid £800 a year, then a fair salary for the Librarian of the House of Commons would be £10,000 a year. He objected to such a waste of the taxpayers' money, and he objected to the whole of the Vote for the salaries of the officials of the House of Lords, which he regarded as a worthless and mischievous institution. The one qualification which now secured a seat in that august assembly was wealth, and, that being so, he thought it would be a very reasonable thing, if the Members of the House of Lords considered themselves as a useful portion of the constitutional machinery of this country, that they should put their hands in their pockets and subscribe the expenses of their own officials. He did not believe the majority of the taxpayers considered the House of Lords a useful institution, and they ought not to be called upon to pay for their officers. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Dublin that this Vote was especially objectionable as regarded the taxpayers of Ireland, nine out of every ten of whom, if polled, would be found to be in favour of sweeping away the House of Lords altogether, regarding it as a purely mischievous institution. He therefore proposed that the Vote should be reduced by £10,000.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I cannot put that. The whole sum asked for is only £8,000.

Mr. DILLON: Then I beg to move that it be reduced by the sum of £6,000.

Mr. MACNEILL was sorry the hon. Member for Lynn Regis had not evinced the courage of his convictions by moving the reduction personally on the one item of the Lord Chancellor's salary. He had himself some gratification in speaking on this Vote, inasmuch as the Gentleman who would defend it was his economic godfather, from whom he first learned the art of moving economic reductions. It must be recollected that the Speaker of the House of Lords was nothing more and nothing less than a Government official. He was appointed by and went out with the Government. Again, the Speaker of the House of Lords would not have the smallest authority to call any Member of that House to order, or control its proceedings in any way. Furthermore, he need not be a Peer or Member of the House of Lords at all; the place where he sat, on the Woolsack, was technically outside the House of Lords, and many Gentlemen had the use of the House of Lords who were not Peers at all, and never had been Peers. Vice Chancellor Leach, who presided for a considerable time over the House of Lords, was never a Peer, and got no money for it. There were many gentlemen of judicial eminence in the House of Lords, who would, of course, gladly take, for the honour of the position, the ten or fifteen minutes' duties four times in the week which that position involved. It was simply a profligate waste of public money to give a gentleman £4,000 a year for filling the post, even if he had no other, but when coupled with the fact that he got £6,000 a year for the discharge of judicial functions, it became really a gross public scandal. Why, he asked, should not the office of Speaker of the House of Lords be absolutely distinct from that of the Lord Chancellor, and the salary of the Speaker be reduced to £2,000 or £2,500 a year, which would be a handsome remuneration for the work performed, more especially as the duties were non-responsible? He should also like to see the Speaker of the House of Lords assume an absolutely non-political character. He should be there from Parliament to Parliament, just like the Speaker of the House of Commons, and should be elected by the Lords themselves. He objected to this salary because it was an inflated salary, a wrong, and improper, and because it was likewise unconstitutional when the office was of a political and partisan character. Then the Serjeant-at-Arms in attendance on the Lord Chancellor received £1,500 a year for, practically, issuing tickets to ladies for admission to the House of Lords. He was sure that any half-pay officer would be willing to undertake the duty at £200 or £300 a year. This was all Imperial taxation for which Ireland had to pay her quota, although she got no benefit in any way whatever. The messenger to the Lord Chancellor received £100 a year. It was only a small item, but it showed the waste that was going on. He thought the whole system was one of gross and extravagant waste. The money which was going in this way was simply ground out of the vitals of the poor to support this institution.

Mr. J. A. RENTOUL (Down, E.) ventured to point out that the total salary of the Lord Chancellor was £10,000 a year. He received £4,000 nominally as Speaker of the House of Lords, but whether it was divided or not in that way the fact remained that the salary of the Lord Chancellor was £10,000 a year. The Lord Chief Justice had a salary of £8,000, but he was only second in command, while the Lord Chancellor was the head of the legal profession, and, considering how difficult it was in a large and great profession of 9,000 members to become Lord Chancellor, he thought a salary of £10,000 was little enough. The hon. and learned Member for Donegal seemed to make it a matter of complaint that the House of Lords only sat for a few minutes on four days of the week. He would remind the hon. Member that the House of Lords had just as much business to do as the House of Commons, but they did their business seriously and soberly, and got through their work expeditously.

They were to be commended for this, and not censured.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston) said that the principle which he and the hon. Member for Lynn Regis advocated on the occasion on which they defeated the late Government on this Vote was that the salaries of the officials of the two Houses should be placed on terms of equality. To the opinion he expressed then he still adhered. He thought there could be no justification whatever for the salaries of the officials of the House of Lords being based on a higher scale than those of the officials of the House of Commons; and he was glad to say that that was also the opinion of the House of Lords itself, so far as he was able to gather from the Report of the Committee on the subject. Since that time great reductions had taken place with regard to the scale upon which all future officials of the House of Lords would be remunerated, and already considerable alterations had taken place. In fact, he was not quite sure whether, at the present moment, the salaries of the officials of the House of Commons were not, on the average, somewhat higher than those of the House of Lords. He did not say whether they ought to be or not, but what they contended for in the past was equality. The hon. Member for East Mayo referred especially to the case of the Librarian, but he thought his comparison between the Assistant Librarian of the House of Commons and the Chief Librarian of the House of Lords was hardly a fair one. He ought to have mentioned that the Chief Librarian of the House of Lords got £800 and certain rooms which he was under an obligation to give up at any time he was required in consideration of an addition of £200 to his salary. His salary, therefore, was really £1,000 and not £800. The hon. Member ought to have compared the salary of the Librarian of the House of Lords at £1,000, with the salary of the Librarian of the House of Commons at £1,200. He thought he should be able to show that, with regard to the principal Clerks at the Table of the House, and with regard to the higher officials, the House of Commons' scale was a higher one than that of the House of Lords. The principal attack on this Vote was with regard to the salary of the Lord Chancellor. Undoubtedly all legal salaries were on a somewhat high scale. They paid their legal officers in the House of Commons, very properly, on a very much higher scale than they paid the ordinary layman—[*laughter*]—but he thought it was only fair to recollect, as the hon. Member for East Down had stated, that the Lord Chancellor, after all, was the head of the legal profession in this country, and that his combined salary of £10,000 was very little above that of the Lord Chief Justice, with the duties of the Speaker of the House of Lords thrown in. But his salary was attacked as Speaker of the House of Lords. His salary in that respect was not so large as that of the Speaker of the House of Commons, though his duties strictly as Speaker in the other House were not perhaps so arduous; but, while £4,000 was a large salary, he did not say it was too large for the work done. But what were the facts of the case? He did not admit the Lord Chancellor's £10,000 was too much for the combined duties, but even if he were to admit it, they would still be bound by Act of Parliament. His hon. Friend was mistaken in supposing that, even if they were to reduce the salary of the Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House of Lords, they would in any way affect his total salary. The Lord Chancellor received £10,0000 a year under two statutes of 1851 and 1852. Under those statutes he was entitled to receive "the net yearly sum of £10,000," whether he got paid as Speaker of the House of Lords or not. The only result of £4,000 being charged on the House of Lords was that, instead of £10,000, only £6,000 was charged on the Consolidated Fund, and that the House of Commons was afforded an opportunity of criticism. This

£10,000 was a stautory charge, and it was not within their power, when discussing the Estimates, to reduce the Lord Chancellor's emoluments.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) supported the reduction. The Irish Members were interested in this Vote to the extent of £1,500, and he complained that the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod should receive £1,000 in addition to a military pension of £994 as Colonel Commandant of the Royal Artillery. This, from a democratic point of view, constituted a very grave scandal. Then the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod received £300, in addition to £200 as Secretary to the Lord Great Chamberlain; and he thought that on inquiry it would be found that the duties of the office were performed more by the last named than by the former. He supported the Amendment of the hon. Member.

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he could not support the reduction as moved, but suggested that it should be altered to one of £4,000, because whether the Committee voted this £6,000 or not the Lord Chancellor would still receive his £10,000 a year out of the Consolidated Fund. His right hon. Friend justified the Lord Chancellor's salary on the ground that it was a legal salary. Yes, but legal salaries were scandalously high. If the Committee looked at the salaries of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General in addition to the salary of the Lord Chancellor, he thought it would be impossible for hon. Members to escape the conviction that the salaries were ridiculously high and furnished no kind of justification for keeping up the Lord Chancellor's salary if it be, as he contended, in itself too high. When his right hon. Friend said that the salary was provided for under Act of Parliament he was afraid that he had been misled by some of his subordinates at the Treasury who were very ignorant of the law. [*Laughter.*] They gave off-hand opinions as to statutes of which they knew nothing, and which did not exist even. He called attention to the salaries of the Serjeant-at-Arms in both Houses, and drew a picture of the patient figure in the House of Commons sitting night after night in his chair, without leaving it for necessary refreshment, while the same official in the House of Lords, after a few minutes' service joined his domestic circle and participated in its enjoyments. [*Laughter.*] The salary of the Serjeant-at-Arms in the House of Lords was £1,596, or £396 more than the Serjeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons received. When the duties of the two officials were contrasted it was obviously monstrous that there should be this difference between their salaries.

*Mr. HANBURY said that the next holder of the office of Serjeant-at-Arms in the House of Lords would only receive £1,000. He did not suppose that his right hon. Friend would wish to reduce the salary of the present official.

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he was quite satisfied with that statement.

Mr. DILLON regretted that he could not comply with the hon. Member's suggestion that he should modify his Amendment. If he were to alter it in the way suggested it would not adequately represent the views which he entertained with regard to the House of Lords.

Mr. MACNEILL hoped that the refreshment rooms in the House of Lords would be placed at the disposal of the House of Commons on occasions when there was a specially large muster of Members. The refreshment rooms in the House of Lords were hardly ever used from year's end to year's end. In 1893, when a great number of Members were in attendance in that House the accommodation in the dining rooms was totally insufficient, and Mr. Shaw Lefevre applied to the authorities in whom was vested the control of the refreshment rooms in the House of Lords to allow those rooms to be used by the Members of the House of Commons when the House of Lords was not sitting, and the request was refused. As the House of Commons voted a certain amount in respect of these rooms, he trusted that in future the Members of the House of Commons would be allowed to use them when they were crowded in their own House.

Mr. J. DALY (Monaghan, S.) thought it must be very disagreeable to the Secretary to the Treasury to have to defend this Vote. He should himself have preferred a Motion for the abolition of the House of Lords rather than one for reducing the salaries of the officials of that House. However, the Irish Members had no sympathy with the House of Lords, and having no sympathy with the masters they could scarcely have any sympathy with the servants. The House of Lords had ever been the stumbling-block in the way of beneficial legislation for Ireland—

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I have already pointed out that, in order to get rid of the House of Lords, legislation would be required, and in accordance with a well known rule you cannot discuss what is a subject for legislation in the course of Debates in Supply.

Mr. DALY said he, of course, accepted the ruling of the Chair, and would not pursue that point. It had been said that the officials of the House of Lords had not very high salaries. Might he in that connection compare the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords with that of the Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons? In the House of Lords the Chairman of Committees received £2,500 a year for taking the Chair for half-an-hour now and then, whereas he had known the Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons to be in the Chair for 12, 15, and even 24 hours—[*laughter*]—while he only got the paltry sum of £2,000. If there was anything unfair in the Vote it was the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords. The hon. Member for East Down took the part of the Lord Chancellor, and compared his position with that of the Lord Chief Justice of England. That was a ridiculous comparison. The Lord Chancellor had to attend the House of Lords for a few hours daily, while the Lord Chief Justice had to attend in Court day after day, and also to go on Circuit. He had never heard a legal gentleman support a proposal to cut down the salary of a legal official. He objected to the Vote on the part of Ireland, who had to pay her share. On that ground he should support the Amendment, and he would appeal to the Secretary to the Treasury to allow the Vote to be reduced for the sake of old days. [*A laugh.*]

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he intended to vote for the Amendment. It appeared that the scale of salaries in the House of Lords was higher in many instances than that in the House of Commons, but he understood that that was so because it had not been deemed advisable to reduce the salaries of existing holders of office, and that in future the salaries would not be above the scale paid in the House of Commons. As to the case of the Lord Chancellor, he thought there was a great deal to be said for the view taken by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite. The Lord Chancellor had much more important duties to perform than those of Speaker of the House of Lords. ["Hear, hear!"] He was the head of the Supreme Court, and taking the scale of salary paid to the Judges, he did not think that £10,000 a year was excessive. ["Hear, hear!"] He knew that in other countries the salaries of judicial officers were much lower than in England, but he was not sure that it was a wise policy to pay low salaries to men occupying judicial and official positions. He was going to vote in favour of the Amendment, however, not because he was in favour of a niggardly and cheeseparing policy. If he were an English Member he would certainly support the Vote. But although he was a Member of this Parliament, he was not an English representative, and although he was in this Parliament, he could scarcely call himself of it. He was there to represent a distinct interest, and of every shilling voted on every Estimate that came before the House, Ireland was called upon to pay more than her fair share, and on that broad ground, and apart altogether from the arguments that had been advanced, he should vote in favour of the Amendment, and, as far as it was in his power to do so, against every shilling that was asked for for the public service of this country. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. MACNEILL wished to have some information with regard to the Lord Great Chamberlain, whose Department cost very close upon £5,000 a year. The Lord Great Chamberlain seemed to have as many domestic servants as King Solomon himself. Ireland was interested in this matter in the proportion of two shares to 17.

*MR. HANBURY said there was no charge for the Lord Great Chamberlain on this Vote at all. The Lord Great Chamberlain was responsible for the care of the Houses of Parliament, and it was simply for the officials under him, cleaners, housekeepers, and so forth, who had to carry out the duties and arrangements of the Palace of Westminster, that the charges set forth in the Vote were made.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES called attention to the number of persons in the House of Lords who enjoyed more than one salary. These included the messenger to the Crown Office, the clerk to the Examiner of Standing Orders, the messenger to ditto, and the clerk of printed papers. He felt bound to call attention to the monstrous system of pluralism of offices which obtained all through these Votes. When a man was in the public service he ought not to receive pay and allowances from the public in another capacity; it ought to be a recognised principle that the whole of his time and service in the capacity in which he was admitted to the public service belonged to the public. The present system was extremely mischievous, and tended both to the demoralisation of the public service and the unnecessary increase of public expense.

Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,485, be granted for the said Service."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 153.—(Division List, No. 193.)

Original Question put:—The Committee divided:—Ayes, 162; Noes, 39. —(Division List, No. 194.)

2. Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,074, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."

MR. CLANCY said he opposed this Vote on the same ground on which he opposed the last, and on which he intended to oppose every Vote submitted to the Committee. [*A laugh.*] He believed that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council discharged their duties in a most satisfactory manner, but as an Irish representative he refused to vote a single penny in aid of the service the Committee rendered. In consequence of the action of the Government upon the financial question, in consequence of their attempt to throw ridicule upon the Royal Commission, and in consequence of their proposal to appoint another Commission to bring in a verdict for them—

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: That question does not arise on the Privy Council Vote.

MR. CLANCY said that was his reason at all events. [*Laughter.*] He did not understand the laughter of hon. Gentlemen, but perhaps they would laugh the other way at the end of the Session, or at the end of this Sitting, if every Irish Member carried out the policy which he intended to pursue, namely, to obstruct every Vote submitted—

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: If the hon. Gentleman avows that his only object in speaking is obstruction, I am afraid I shall have to put the more severe Rules of the House in force against him. [*Cheers.*]

MR. CLANCY said he had no intention of disguising his intentions. In his opinion any means that were open to them, whether within the Rules of Order or without the Rules of Order - [*laughter*]—

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The hon. Member is not confining himself to the Vote before the House, and I must ask him to resume his seat. [*Cheers.*]

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that £1,700 was set down as the salary of the Clerk of the Council. In former times the Privy Council was the most important body in the State, and the business of the Clerk was to keep a book which formed a permanent record of the advice given to the Sovereign and of the grounds upon which the advice was based. It was that book alone which enabled the House to impeach a Minister for any misdoing. Now, however, the Privy Council had substantially ceased to exist. There was what was called a Committee of the Privy Council, which consisted of Cabinet Ministers, but no record of their proceedings was kept. As the office of Clerk was, therefore, a purely nominal one, £1,700 a year was far too large a salary to pay. He moved, "That item A (Salaries), be reduced by £700, in respect of the salary of the Clerk of the Council."

MR. MACNEILL said there was no record of the proceedings of the Privy Council, whose members were sworn to inviolable secresy, and this clerkship was merely a means of giving outdoor relief to some supporter or stalwart of one Government or another. He desired to know for what service the Clerk of the Council was paid £1,700. He was unable to see from the Estimate whether the salary was appropriated to the Privy Council in its judicial, its administrative, or its consultative capacity. He believed it was appropriated to the Council in its consultative capacity; and, if that were so, he declared, as a matter of fact, that the Clerk did nothing to earn the salary. He toiled not, he wrote not, and he reaped a golden harvest, but he had not the satisfaction of reaping it with the sweat of his brow.

*MR. HANBURY said that while in some respects the duties of the Clerk of the Council had diminished, in other respects they had increased. The salary of the Clerk was made up of two items—£200 for attendance on Her Majesty, and £1,500 as Clerk of the Council. Formerly there used to be four Clerks, but, as the work of the Council decreased, so the number had been reduced until now there was only one.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES said his right hon. Friend must have been misinformed by some subordinate when he said that Orders in Council were prepared by the Clerk of the Council. As a matter of fact, every Order in Council was drawn up by the Department to which it referred. He knew as a matter of personal knowledge that a certain Order in Council in regard to the rule of the road at sea was drawn up by some second division Clerk of the Board of Trade.

MR. WALTER HAZELL (Leicester) said it was very difficult, if not impossible, for the Committee to discuss fairly and adequately the duties of offices such as the office of Clerk of the Council. He thought there should be a permanent Committee of the House to investigate the duties and emoluments of every office when it became vacant, and recommend to the House such changes as it thought fit in regard to those duties and emoluments.

MR. MACNEILL said he desired to again repeat that the Clerk of the Council got £1,700 a year for doing nothing, and he had five or six assistants to help him in doing nothing. The item of £200 to which the Secretary of the Treasury had referred as being paid to the Clerk of the Council was the method of paying the Clerk of the Council's travelling expenses from Whitehall on a Saturday afternoon down to the Isle of Wight or Windsor on the rare occasions on which there were Privy Councillors to be sworn in and Her Majesty was present at the Council. This office was a sinecure, and a gross and corrupt job. He remembered they used to say at college that the best proctor was he who had been the most notorious scamp in his younger days. [*Laughter.*] That was not the only office in which that principle had been applied. He would study Hanbury in "Hansard" in order to learn how to attack this item, but in the meantime perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would give them an official answer, to which they might listen with entertainment and instruction.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 167.—(Division List, No. 195.)

Mr. MACNEILL moved:—

"That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £1,142, in respect of the salary of the Deputy Clerk of the Council and the Chief Clerk."

He said this gentleman did nothing, and assisted another, getting £1,700 a year to do nothing. He hoped that in these matters the Irish Members would have assistance from English Radical Members. The discussions should not fall entirely on the former.

Mr. ALBERT SPICER (Monmouth Boroughs) asked the Secretary to the Treasury whose duty it was to report periodically to the Treasury whether these positions in connection with the Privy Council were still necessary to the public service?

Mr. HAZELL asked whether, if this particular office in some way came to an end, the right hon. Gentleman would consider it necessary, in the public service, that another gentleman should be appointed?

*Mr. HANBURY observed that, in order to show the careful control exercised, partly by the Lord President of the Council and partly by the Treasury, over this Vote, he had stated, in reply to the last Amendment, that these clerks had gradually been cut down as the work had decreased. A careful eye was kept over the Estimate with a view to the possibility of reduction on vacancies occurring.

Mr. SPICER said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the question who was responsible, on the part of the Privy Council, for informing the Treasury that every one of these officers was still necessary for the public service?

*Mr. HANBURY replied that the head of the Department—the Duke of Devonshire—was responsible for sending in the Estimate.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL pointed out that there was an increase in the Vote this year as compared with last year. In the previous year it was £1,117, whilst this year it was £1,142. Was it by a Treasury Minute that the increase took place?

*Mr. HANBURY: An annual increment of £25 has accrued. This officer was appointed upon a certain scale of salary. When the appointment was made the scale was based upon the idea that he was to have an annual increment, and he has to get what was promised him when he took the place.

Mr. T. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) asked if these were two distinct offices occupied by one gentleman?

*Mr. HANBURY: Yes; this is indicated in the column headed "Numbers." He has duties of his own to preform as Chief Clerk, and in the absence of the Clerk of the Council he takes his place.

Mr. BAYLEY thought it would have been a great deal better if the Estimate had stated that.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) remarked that the right hon. Gentleman had told them the number of reductions of the clerks, but that referred to Clerks of the Council. He saw that, taking out this gentleman with the two offices, they should still have left one senior clerk, one junior clerk, one clerk of the second division, and two clerks of the second division. Surely that was enough staff to assist a gentleman who was doing nothing?

*MR. HANBURY: I beg to move, "That the question be now put."

Question put "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 163; Noes, 49.—(Division List, No. 196.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 43; Noes, 168.—(Division List, No. 197.)

*MR. HANBURY claimed to move "That the original Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 39.—(Division List, No. 198.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 7th July.

CHURCH PATRONAGE TRANSFER BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 18th May.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

CANALS PROTECTION (LONDON) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

CANALS AND NAVIGABLE RIVERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes after Twelve o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 10th May 1897.

GREECE AND THE POWERS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I wish to ask the noble Marquess a Question of which I have given him private notice—whether it is true that the Greek Government have announced their intention to withdraw their troops from Crete, and whether it is true that they have asked the Powers to mediate between them and the Turkish Government?

*THE PRIME MINISTER (The MARQUESS of SALISBURY): If I were to answer the noble Earl in the negative to both Questions I should be strictly accurate, but yet I might mislead him; and therefore I will give one word in explanation. The Greek Government have not asked for mediation, but the members of the Greek Government have expressed a desire for it, and I do not think the Greek Government intend officially, as a whole, to ask for it. With respect to Crete, there is the same indefiniteness in the present state of things. The Greek Government do not conceive it to be consistent, as I gather, with their position, to promise the immediate or definite withdrawal of the troops. But I understand, though we have not got absolutely official confirmation of it, they are prepared to say that they will withdraw them in the future, and at no very distant future. I am sorry to say that, as we stand at present, I do not think that this assurance entirely satisfies all the Powers. However, I have only to answer for ourselves, and our instructions have been to join in any procedure for the purpose of entering on mediation which is acceptable to the others. In our view the main point is, if possible, to arrest the effusion of blood, and we are not very particular about forms. That is all I can say at present. I regret exceedingly that the Greek Government is more particular about forms than I think the circumstances of the case justify. [*Cheers.*]

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

LORD COLERIDGE moved the Second Reading of this Bill, which, in his opinion, was a humble but useful Measure. It proposed to do away with the distinction in the treatment of jurors in cases of felony and in cases of misdemeanour. No one could now discern the distinction between those two classes of cases. Whatever history might say, at present some of the gravest crimes were misdemeanours, and some of the most paltry crimes were felonies. But in the case of the trial of felonies, however paltry the crime, when once the jury had been sworn they must be kept together until they discharged themselves by giving a verdict. This was not the case in questions of misdemeanour. The result was inconvenient in the administration of justice, because, as the afternoon approached, it was impossible to take felonies lest they should last over the day. Or, if they were taken, the trial was very often prolonged to such an extent that the jurors became fatigued. He did not understand how justice could be advanced by such a barbarous and old-fashiond method of procedure; and he thought that the ancient distinction should be given up. Probably the language of the Bill required amendment in some particulars; but in point of principle he recommended the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House.

*THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE (Lord RUSSELL of KILLOWEN) said that there were few men connected with the administration of criminal justice who did not feel the need for this reform. Before, however, this Bill could be effective for real good, it would have to be materially altered from the form in which it had reached the House. It would be within the recollection of many of their Lordships that cases had occurred in which, had it been necessary to arraign a prisoner on the charge of felony, it would have been impossible to try him satisfactorily. The celebrated Tichborne case was an illustration. Fortunately the ends of justice were achieved by indicting the prisoner for misdemeanour, under which he got a very considerable sentence of imprisonment. But had it been necessary to make the experiment of indicting him for the felony of forging the Tichborne bonds, the experiment must have broken down, as it would have been impossible to get a jury secluded from their business and homes for 50 or more days. The restriction of the discretionary power of the Judge to allow a jury to separate simply for the purposes of refreshment or rest was wholly inadequate. Sir H. Poland had pointed out that this limitation would be a most unfortunate one. In the middle of the trial the Judge might be taken ill, or might be compelled to adjourn for the purpose of the attendance of a witness; or other circumstances might make it reasonable that the jury, or some of them, should be allowed a brief interval to go to their homes. None of these cases would be covered by the language of the Bill as it stood. As to the objection against giving this discretionary power to the Judge, he thought the short answer to it was this—that, if there were cases in which it was right that the jury should be allowed to separate, and cases in which it would not be proper, he could not see who was to exercise the discretion unless it were the Judge who had all the circumstances before him. Little as the Judges cared to have increased discretionary power, he did not think this was a case in which they ought to shrink from the exercise of that power. There were some, and he believed the Lord Chancellor was among them, who would exclude murder and treason cases from the purview of the Bill; but those were crimes which, althought serious, infinitely varied in their character; and if it were proper to give the Judge discretion at all, it would be proper to give it in those cases just as in any others.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD HALSBURY) entirely agreed that some alteration of the law was proper at the present time; and, further, that the limitations which had been alluded to would make the Bill of no use at all. It was quite true that there were some misdemeanours very grave and some felonies very trivial, and therefore he would be disposed to say that the true distinction ought to be between cases which were very grave and those which were very trivial. He could not help thinking that when the time came it would be a serious matter for the House to consider whether or not on trial by jury of a person whose life was at stake, and who was possessed of considerable means, it would be desirable to leave the discretion to the Judge rather than to make it part of the law. It might be worth everything to the person to procure disagreement among the jury; and he might cause the jury to be shadowed in some way or other, in order that by the expenditure of a large sum of money he might bring about such a disagreement. The possibility of such a temptation ought not to be presented. But that was a point which could more properly be discussed in Committee. The reason why he would object to leave it to the discretion of a Judge was, not that he in the least questioned the impartiality of the exercise of the discretion, but that it would be invidious for a Judge to say, "In this case I will allow the jury to separate, and in another, I will not." When the Bill got into Committee, he would move Amendments directed to this and other points. At present the only question was whether the Bill should be read a Second time; and as he entirely agreed with the general object of the Bill, he supported the Second Reading.

LORD HERSCHELL said that he agreed that the Bill should be read a Second time, and that in Committee it would require consideration. The point mainly was whether they should in all cases leave it to the discretion of the Judge, or whether there was a certain class of cases in which the present system should continue. He did not intend to express an opinion about it, although he did not see that there would be serious objection to excluding cases of murder from the scope of the Bill.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

NAVY AND MARINES (WILLS) ACT (1865) AMENDMENT BILL.

*THE EARL OF HOPETOUN moved the Second Reading of this Bill. It was intended to exempt the wills of naval pensioners from the operation of Section 5 of the Act of 1865, and also to allow a solicitor, or in Scotland a law agent, to act as an attesting witness under conditions set forth, thereby giving the men a larger freedom of choice without in any way depriving them of the protection which the Act afforded them.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

LAND TRANSFER BILL. [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

RAILWAY ASSESSORS (SCOTLAND) SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Second Reading (which stands appointed for To-morrow) put off to Friday next.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY (TRANSFER OF PATRONAGE) BILL.

Second Reading (which stands appointed for To-morrow) put off to Friday next.

House Adjourned at a Quarter before Five o'Clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 10th May 1897.

PRIME MINISTER (DUAL OFFICES).

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) gave notice that on an early day he would call attention to the anomalous position of Lord Salisbury as Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and to the severance of the office of First Lord of the Treasury from the Leadership of the Government, and should move:—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the union in one individual of the offices of Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs introduces a fundamental change in the work of the foreign policy of the United Kingdom, and is a rupture of an old-established and invariable practice of the greatest importance to the good conduct of the public affairs of this country."

Laughter.]

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLY (RIVER NETHY).

Mr. J. CALDWELL (Lanark, Mid): On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty (Mr. J. G. Weir), I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, having regard to the fact that the water of the River Nethy, in the Badenoch district of Inverness-shire, has been rendered unfit for drinking purposes by the discharge of sewage from several lodges and large farms above the village of Causer within the last 20 years, he will state why the Local Government Board for Scotland have failed to require the local authority to take action against those who are responsible for the pollution of the water of the river; whether he is aware that the local authority has taken action to compel the villagers, who for years have been dependent on the River Nethy for drinking water, to supply the village with water from another source a mile distant; and whether the Local Government Board for Scotland will require the local authority to take steps to free the water of the River Nethy from pollution?

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Graham Murray, Buteshire): The Local Government Board have frequently had under consideration the question of the water supply of the village of Causer. They have urged the local authority to take steps to provide a proper supply, and the local authority have taken proceedings against the inhabitants with this object. The Local Government Board have not required the local authority to take steps to have the river freed from pollution, as the Board have no power to do so. Moreover, it is not certain that the river can be made a suitable source of supply.

PENSIONS COMMUTATION BOARD.

Mr. CALDWELL: On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that the tables of the Pensions Commutation Board which were promulgated immediately after the passing of the Pensions Commutation Act of 1871, when 3 per cent. Consols stood at 92¾, have not been once revised, although 2¾ per cent. Consols now stand over 112, he will consider the advisability of seeking powers such as will enable the Pensions Commutation Board to render the tables more in accord with the present value of money?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The reduction of the rate of interest on which these tables are based can only be effected by legislation, and I am not prepared to recommend such legislation to Parliament. No public interest would be served by the grant of increased facilities for commutation.

POSTAL FACILITIES (ISLAND OF LEWIS).

MR. CALDWELL: On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the people of the townships of Cleascro, Achmore, and Lochganvich, Island of Lewis, suffer serious inconvenience in consequence of his Department having failed to establish a post office in the district as a place of call for correspondence; will he explain why, on the 7th January last, he renewed his suggestion that the persons affected should agree together to put up a roadside box on the route of the Stornoway and Callanish mail into which the driver could deliver letters; whether he is aware that this suggestion does not commend itself to the people of the district, inasmuch as its adoption, apart from the cost of the box, would involve the manufacture of upwards of 50 keys for the use of the various heads of families, each of whom would have access to his neighbours' correspondence; whether he will again consider the advisability of establishing a post office, such as would not only be a place of call for letters, but would also provide the inhabitants of the district with facilities for obtaining stamps, etc., and for posting letters; and whether he will state the cost of a post office of this description?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): In giving effect to the postal reforms announced in the Budget Speech, the Postmaster General hopes to be able at an early date to bring the neighbourhood in question within the official delivery, which will be a more convenient arrangement to the inhabitants than the establishment of the proposed office of call. The postman who delivers the letters will receive at the same time any letters for the post, and will also sell stamps.

GAMBLING IN FUTURES AND OPTIONS.

MR. J. L. CAREW (Dublin, College Green): On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick (Mr. W. FIELD), I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture, the National Agricultural Union, the Farmers' Club, and other influential societies have all passed resolutions asking the Government to appoint a special Commission to inquire into and report on the effect of gambling in futures on agriculture and trade; and whether such a Commission will be appointed at an early date?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have received copies of resolutions of the nature indicated by the hon. Member which have been passed by a number of societies, chiefly connected with agriculture. I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by the appointment of a Commission.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT.

MR. T. G. ASHTON (Beds, Luton): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Education Department will sanction the appointment of teachers of schools which are attached to associations formed under the Voluntary Schools Act to be members of the governing body of such associations?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Committee of Council would not refuse to sanction such an appointment.

EDUCATION (HALF-TIME SCHOLARS).

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether Her Majesty's Government propose to introduce this Session any legislation to raise the age for half-time labour in accordance with the pledges given at the Berlin Conference?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not think there is any chance of legislation, such as that proposed by my hon. Friend, being introduced during the present Session.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION (IRELAND).

MR. CAREW: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he intends at an early date to introduce the promised Measure to amend the existing system of Private Bill legislation for Ireland?

MR. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet come to any decision in reference to the introduction of a Measure to reform the system of Private Bill legislation so far as concerns Ireland?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I can only say that the prospect of the Bill for amending the system of Private Bill legislation for Ireland being introduced during the present Session must depend on the progress of public business generally.

TUSKAR LIGHT (TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION).

MR. GEOFFREY DRAGE (Derby): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the telephone communication with the Tuskar Light is under the control of the Post Office; whether any application has been received from the Liverpool Steam Shipowners' Association representing the advantage it would be to the shipping trade if vessels passing the Tuskar Light, and signalling, could be promptly reported; and whether arrangements could be made with the Irish Light Commissioners so that the telephone may be used for that purpose?

*MR. HANBURY: The telephone communication with the Tuskar Lighthouse is not under the control of the Post Office. It was provided, and it is maintained, by the Post Office, but at the cost of the Board of Trade. An application from the Liverpool Steam Shipowners' Association to the effect stated by the hon. Member was received by the Postmaster General, and was referred to the Board of Trade. The Postmaster General is informed by the Board of Trade that the whole question of commercial signalling from lighthouses electrically connected with the shore is under consideration.

CYCLING IN HYDE PARK.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works (1) if he can prevail upon His Royal Highness the Ranger of Hyde Park to extend the time for bicycles from 12 noon till 1 p.m., having regard to the fact that there is but little increase in traffic in that hour; and (2) in any case, if persons using the boats on the Serpentine can be allowed to push their cycles from the boathouse to the Victoria Road within that hour?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I do not see my way to adopt the suggestion made in the first part of my hon. Friend's Question; but I will instruct the police to use their discretion in interpreting the rule with reference to the cases indicated by him in the second portion of the Question.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

MR. E. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether space for erecting seats from which to view the Jubilee procession has been granted to the County Council and the Vestries of the county of London, but not to the Justices of the county; and whether the Justices will receive the same privilege, for the purpose of erecting at their own cost a stand to enable them to view the Jubilee procession?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir; I have placed a site for a stand at the disposal of the London County Council, who have undertaken to provide, as far as possible, for the Vestries; but I am sorry to say that I am not able to provide space for the county Justices or any other bodies.

MR. J. F. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the interests of the public safety, special precautions will be taken to guard against the hasty erection of stands along the route of the Jubilee procession; and whether it is intended to insist on all such stands being officially inspected and strictly limited to a prescribed number of occupants?

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): This is a matter with which the County Council have power to deal, except in regard to the portion of the route that lies within the City, under the London Building Act of 1894. The Council have given notice by advertisement, placard, and in other ways, that temporary structures cannot be erected without their consent, and that balconies intended to be used on the day should be properly shored up. They have also made arrangements for the examination of plans of such structures and for proper supervision being exercised over their erection. Tools and materials will be kept in readiness at certain points for dealing promptly with any dangerous structure. Similar precautions will doubtless also be taken by the City authorities.

PARIS FIRE
(SAFETY OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS).

MR. J. AIRD (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, having regard to the terrible calamity in Paris, he will be willing to appoint a Committee or a Commission to consider the desirability of some further measures being taken for the safety of the public in this country, not only for theatres, but for public meetings and bazaars?

*MR. T. G. FARDELL (Paddington, S.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question I desire to supplement it with another, of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether he will consider during the Parliamentary Recess the advisability of introducing in the course of the next Session of Parliament a Bill to give effect to the Report of the Select Committee of the House in 1892 on Theatres and places of Entertainment, and so extend the provisions of the Bill as to bring within its scope all places, whether licensed or not, which are used or intended to be used for any purpose where the public are invited to assemble?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: This very important Question has already been considered by more than one Committee, including the Select Committee of 1892, to which my hon. Friend the Member for South Paddington alludes, and I cannot say that at present it seems to me to be necessary to have a further Inquiry. I will carefully consider, however, the question of whether any or what legislation can be introduced further on with the view of securing the public, so far as may be possible, against the occurrence of any such terrible disaster as happened last week in Paris.

MR. AIRD: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that at the present time there is no control whatever as regards inspection of bazaars against fires?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I am quite aware that there is no control except over places which happen to be licensed for other purposes, when it is possible to attach to the licence a condition which insures some security for life against fire. It is a very difficult question upon which to legislate, but looking at the information which we have, and which has been supplied by the various Committees of Inquiry, I cannot see that at present there is any necessity for further investigation. That there ought to be some legislation I think is very possible, and to that I am prepared to give my most earnest attention. ["Hear, hear!"]

LINKED-BATTALION SYSTEM.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War to what extent the linked-battalion system is now disorganised by both battalions of an increasing number of groups being abroad at the same time?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): At present seven regiments have both battalions abroad.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Resolutions have been passed by the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians and Carrickmacross Town Commissioners requesting the Great Northern Railway Company to run third-class passenger carriages on the mail train leaving Dublin at 6 a.m. for Belfast, and that a train for mails and passengers be run from Dundalk for Enniskillen at 7.21 a.m. on arrival of the mail train from Dublin; whether he is aware that other railway companies in Ireland are running third-class passenger carriages on their mail trains; and what course he intends to take to give effect to the Resolutions in question?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is aware the Resolutions have been passed, and regrets he is not able to give effect to them. The train proposed between Dundalk and Enniskillen is offered by the Company for the purpose of carrying the mails on terms which the Postmaster General is obliged to decline. The Postmaster General is aware that one Company is running third-class passenger carriages and that another has undertaken to do so. He hopes the practice may become general, but he has no power to deal with passenger traffic. I am quite aware of the inconvenience to both mails and passengers of the long delay at Dundalk.

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, has he received a copy of a Resolution unanimously adopted by the Clones Board of Guardians requesting that the terms offered by the Great Northern Railway Company, in regard to the conveyance of mails, be accepted, so that the town of Clones and the district generally from Dundalk to Enniskillen may have the advantage of a connection with the limited mail at Dundalk, and the earlier delivery of mails which would thus be obtained; and will the Postmaster General give effect to the said Resolution?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General does not appear to have received a copy of the Resolution to which the hon. Member refers. The subject of the Resolution, has, however, been fully considered, and the Postmaster General has not felt himself able to accept the terms offered by the Great Northern Railway Company for improving the Day Mail Service to Clones and Enniskillen.

POST OFFICE (FEMALE CLERKS).

MR. R. McKENNA (Monmouth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that in certain post offices female clerks are compelled to be on duty for considerable periods in the year at and before 5 a.m.; and whether it is possible to make such arrangements that female clerks will not be on duty at so early an hour?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is not aware of the circumstance mentioned. It is contrary to the general practice of the Department to bring female clerks on duty at and before 5 a.m., and if the hon. Member will say which are the post offices he has in view inquiry shall be made in the matter.

GRANARD (POLICE ARRANGEMENTS).

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists in Granard with the police arrangements there, because the district inspector, head constable, and sergeant are Protestants, whilst the great proportion of the men are Roman Catholics; and will he direct a change of officers in this case?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware that dissatisfaction exists at Granard with the police arrangements there. The allocation of members of the force is made independently of religious considerations, and there is no intention at present to direct a change of officers in this case.

MR. FARRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiry into the matter with the view of making a change?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I see no occasion for making such an inquiry. As I have already said, religious considerations are not taken into account in making these appointments.

RED SEA (LIGHTING).

Sir EDWARD HILL (Bristol, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has recently been called to the dangers to navigation consequent on the defective lighting of the southern part of the Red Sea; whether any special reason exists for the long neglect of this question; whether there is any prospect of lights being placed on or in the neighbourhood of Abu Ail and Mocha Shoal; and whether Her Majesty's Government will use their best endeavours to hasten the action of the Turkish authorities?

Mr. RITCHIE: In reply to my hon. and gallant Friend, I can only repeat the answer given to my right hon. Friend the Member for North-East Manchester, on 25th March, by my right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who said that Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, acting under instructions from Her Majesty's Government, had addressed a circular to the representatives of the Great Powers inviting their co-operation in a joint representation to the Turkish Government for authority to reconstruct a number of fresh lights at the southern end of the Red Sea, including lights at Abu Ail and Mocha Shoal. Her Majesty's Government must await the result of these communications before considering any other possible arrangements.

ARD WEST PIER (CARNA, CONNEMARA).

Mr. W. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the condition of the Ard West Pier, in Carna, Connemara, which was partially destroyed by a storm in 1894, and the remaining portion of which is in such a dangerous condition that the people are afraid to moor their boats alongside it; and whether the Grand Jury, having neglected to authorise the necessary repairs, he will exercise his influence to urge upon the Board of Works the desirability of making those repairs at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Communications have been received as to the state of this pier, and the Board of Works have instructed their engineer to make a report, as soon as possible, in reference to its condition.

POSTAL DELIVERY (CARNA).

Mr. O'MALLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will advise the delivery of letters on Sundays to Carna, Connemara, as at present great inconvenience is caused by the absence of a Sunday post to this populous district?

*Mr. HANBURY: Even the week-day service to Carna is carried on at a loss to the revenue, and, as a Sunday post could not be established without additional expenditure, the Postmaster General is precluded on this ground from complying with the wishes of the hon. Member.

TURCO-GREEK WAR.

General McCALMONT (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has noticed a recent report of the bombardment of Santa Quaranta, a defenceless village on the Albanian coast, by Greek men-of-war, and whether he proposes to make any inquiry into the matter?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. Curzon, Lancashire, Southport): Her Majesty's Consul at Corfu reported on the 24th of April that the Greek Squadron had destroyed Santa Quaranta. The matter is a regrettable incident of the war; and I fear that no useful purpose would be served by making inquiry with regard to it.

ARMY REGULATIONS (ST. PATRICK'S DAY).

Mr. J. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on St. Patrick's Day the sergeants of the 6th Inniskilling Dragoons were forbidden to have their usual dance, and instead of St. Patrick's Day being observed according to the custom in this regiment as a holiday, an extra parade was ordered; also, that a junior officer of this regiment was fined for wearing a piece of shamrock in his cap on St. Patrick's Day, although not on parade; who were the officers responsible for these proceedings; and, whether the Commander-in-Chief has made any investigation into these matters, or expressed to the officer responsible for the order of the regiment his views as to such proceedings?

Mr. BRODRICK: The commanding officer, in his discretion, considered it better that the sergeants should have their dance a few days later. It has not been the custom in the regiment to have a dance on St. Patrick's Day or to keep it as a holiday. No extra parade was ordered, and no officer was fined for wearing shamrock. There was nothing in the proceedings to call for any observations from the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. MACNEILL: For what reason was the dance postponed?

Mr. BRODRICK: I believe the dance was postponed at the discretion of the commanding officer. I have no idea what was the reason, and I do not intend to ask. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War why, when by letter sent to him to the War Office by the honourable Member for South Donegal, giving what particulars were in his power of the sentence of seven days' imprisonment with hard labour for wearing a shamrock, inflicted on an Irish soldier of the 4th Battalion King's Royal Rifles, who was at that time undergoing that sentence, inquiries were not immediately instituted into the case, which if instituted would have had the effect of stopping the further punishment of the prisoner?

The hon. Member also asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether the authorities have intimated to the commanding officer who sentenced, on the complaint of Sub-Lieutenant Blundell, of the 4th Battalion Royal Rifles, a private named Grindle to seven days' imprisonment with hard labour, for refusing on St. Patrick's Day to take off a shamrock, which Sub-Lieutenant Blundell, in making the order, termed "that dirty bit of greenstuff," any opinion as to the propriety of his conduct in the infliction of a sentence of such severity; whether any explanation has been required from Sub-Lieutenant Blundell of his use of such language, which he has admitted, in reference to the Irish national emblem; and whether the authorities intend, with a view of preventing such occurrences in the future, to express their sense, by reprimand or otherwise, of Sub-Lieutenant Blundell's conduct?

Mr. BRODRICK: In reply to both Questions, I stated to the House fully some weeks ago the facts of this case and the course taken by the general officer commanding at Aldershot, and I have no further statement to make upon it.

Mr. MACNEILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman remember that I wrote him a letter and gave him private notice of my intention to put a question with reference to this matter? I gave him the name of the regiment, but could not give him that of the man, and instead of answering, the right hon. Gentleman executed, as a military man, a strategic movement behind the Speaker's chair. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. BRODRICK: The hon. Member addressed me an indefinite question by means of a letter as to whether certain events had happened at Aldershot with regard to individuals whose names he did not mention. I told him if he would supply me with the names I would endeavour to get the information.

Mr. MACNEILL asserted that the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the second question now addressed to him.

Mr. BRODRICK: I made a full statement with regard to what has occurred, and I am not prepared to make any further statement.

Mr. MACNEILL again rose, when,

*Mr. SPEAKER, interposing, said: The right hon. Gentleman is perfectly within his right in saying that he declines to make any further answer.

Mr. MACNEILL: Very well, I will give him a bad quarter of an hour on the Estimates. [*Laughter.*]

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to guard against the repetition of such scandals on future St. Patrick Days?

Mr. BRODRICK: It is impossible for me to give any other answer than I have given. Every man in the Army who desires to wear any emblem which is not part of the authorised and recognised uniform can only do so by the permission of his commanding officer.

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Northumberland Fusiliers, on the 23rd April, St. George's Day, wore on parade, in accordance with the custom of the regiment on that day, each a red and white rose as a national emblem in his regimentals; and on what principle Irish soldiers in the British Army are punished or insulted for wearing the Irish national emblem on St. Patrick's Day?

MR. BRODRICK: The Secretary of State has no information as to the wearing of roses by the Northumberland Fusiliers on April 23; but as it has been the custom of the regiment for more than 200 years so to distinguish the day under authority from the commanding officer, it is probable they did wear them; individual soldiers in corps in which no such custom exists can only wear emblems if authorised by the commanding officer.

MR. MACNEILL said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the second part of the Question.

MR. BRODRICK: What the hon. Gentleman, I understand, maintains is that an Irish soldier may wear anything he pleases on a particular day. [*Laughter and cries of* "No!"] The answer is that, for the wearing of anything beyond the authorised uniform, whatever the emblem may be, authority must be obtained from the officer commanding the regiment. [*Cheers.*]

CAPTAIN DONELAN asked whether the custom of wearing the shamrock was not even more ancient than that of wearing the rose?

MR. MACNEILL: I would ask whether, as there are 20,000 Irish soldiers—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. Member is raising an argument. The Question has been fully answered. Whether he is satisfied with the answer is another matter.

MR. MACNEILL: I am utterly dissatisfied. [*Laughter.*]

RAIATEA (DISTURBANCES).

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any official report of recent disturbances at Raiatea has reached the Foreign Office; what understanding has prevailed for some years past between the British and French Governments with respect to this island; and whether Raiatea is now practically a French possession?

MR. CURZON: Reports have been received from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris and Her Majesty's Consul at Tahiti of measures which have been taken by a French naval force against the natives of Raiatea. The French Government have a protectorate over Raiatea.

ARMY HORSES.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Colony of Victoria has offered to supply a recent requisition for 1,500 horses from his Department; and whether, when his choice is limited to colonial or foreign horses, he will in future give the preference to the former?

MR. BRODRICK: No requisition for 1,500 horses was made, a much smaller quantity being required. The Colony of Victoria offered to land 1,500 horses in South Africa, but at nearly double the price at which suitable horses could be obtained. Preference is always given to home and colonial stock when a suitable supply can be obtained at a reasonable price.

CAPTAIN DONELAN asked whether preference would be given to Irish horses?

MR. BRODRICK said the expense of taking horses from Ireland to South Africa made it prohibitive in this case.

POST OFFICE ANNUITIES.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthen, W.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether complaints have from time to time been made in reference to the scale of Post Office annuities, which requires that a person of 85 years of age should pay as large a sum for an annuity as a person of 80; and whether he will consider the question of so amending the table of annuities as to give to persons over 80 the advantage of a corresponding reduction in the scale of payment?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Very few complaints have reached either the Post Office or the National Debt Commissioners with regard to the point to which attention is called in the Question. I will consider the matter, but I cannot undertake to amend the table of annuities in the manner desired. There is a difficulty about securing proof as to the age of very old people, and I am told that the chances of life are not diminished in proportion to the difference between the ages of 80 and 85. I understand that insurance companies find similar precautions necessary to prevent loss on annuities at these great ages.

ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY.

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether a letter, written on the 1st of this month by the Director of the Science and Art Museum, Dublin, to the President of the Royal Irish Academy, suggesting that six or eight cases containing the best objects in the collection of the Academy, such as the Cross of Cong, etc., should be, during alterations to the room in which the collection of the Royal Irish Academy is now displayed, transported in one of Her Majesty's ships, to be obtained through His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, to Woolwich, and from thence to a good position in the South Kensington Museum, when, after remaining there for four or six weeks, they would be brought again to Dublin with the same precautions as on their outward journey, has had the sanction of the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education; whether the agreement between the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education and the Royal Irish Academy, sealed and signed in November, 1890, whereby it was expressly conditioned and declared that the said Lords of the Committee of Council on Education shall, by acceptance hereof, be bound and obliged to retain the said collection in Ireland, is still binding on both parties; or, if abrogated, for what reasons and from what date; and, if this communication from an official of the Department of Science and Art be unauthorised, will the Department assure the Royal Irish Academy that no further attempts to remove their museum from Dublin will be made?

Sir J. GORST: I understand that the letter in question was a private one. The President of the Royal Irish Academy replied that there were objections to the arrangement suggested, and the matter has dropped.

Mr. MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this private letter emanated from the official office, written on official paper, and signed by this gentleman as director?

Sir J. GORST: Private letters are sometimes written by official persons.

CANALS AND NAVIGABLE RIVERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether representations have been made to him by the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland to the effect that statutes passed in the reigns of George III. and William IV. would be infringed by the passage of the Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill; and will he lay the correspondence with the railway company upon the Table of the House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. J. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): Representations have been made to me by the railway company that, under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, and 58 Geo. III., cap 35, they are bound to do whatever may be required by the Board of Control or Board of Trade to render the canal as little dangerous to the public as is consistent with its use, that they have carried out the directions and requirements of these bodies and are willing to continue to do so, and that the Bill of the hon. Member is entirely unnecessary. It is not intended to lay the correspondence on the Table.

PRISON SYSTEM (SCOTLAND).

Mr. T. C. H. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, under the present Scots prison system, prisoners on the sick list are dependent for nursing solely upon the offices of any two fellow criminals (without test of knowledge or capacity) who may happen to be placed in the same cell; and, if so, whether, having regard to the fact that this system has been condemned and abolished both in England and Ireland, he will take steps to secure its abolition in Scotland also, and the substitution in lieu thereof of adequate provision for the proper nursing of sick prisoners by trained infirmary warders or otherwise?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The hon. Member has been misinformed. Special "Nurse" warders are appointed where necessary. In other cases nursing duties are performed either by the ordinary warder staff or by specially selected prisoners. When prisoners are very ill there is power to send them to a hospital, with the assent of the sheriff. The existing system works satisfactorily, and I see no reason for altering it.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when it is intended to take any Committee stage which may be necessary on the expenses involved by the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, on which the question of costs may be raised?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I have consulted the officers of the House, and learn that it would not be usual to take any Committee stage that may be necessary in regard to the expenses of arbitrators or compensation to Crown workmen until the Bill has been read a Second time.

TELEGRAPH OFFICES (PUBLIC GUARANTEE).

MR. W. T. HOWELL (Denbigh Boroughs): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the contemplated reduction in the amount of guarantee required for small telegraph offices is to apply to existing guarantees or only to future guarantees?

MR. HANBURY: The concession recently announced with regard to guarantees for small telegraph offices will apply to existing as well as future guarantees. But the concession is not rightly described as a reduction in the amount of guarantee required. It is an undertaking by the Exchequer to share equally with the guarantor any loss which may arise upon the guaranteed office.

LOAN FUND SOCIETIES (IRELAND).

MR. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when the new rules suggested by the recent Commission of Inquiry into the working of the Irish Loan Fund Board system will come into operation; what steps, if any, have been taken to carry out the recommendations of the Commission; and whether the Government intend, by legislation or otherwise, to remedy the abuses of the Irish Loan Fund system disclosed by the Report of the Commission?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The new rules approved by the Loan Fund Board have been issued to Loan Fund societies for adoption within 28 days. These rules substantially embody most of the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry. The Government are considering the question of the necessity of further legislation with a view to strengthen the administration and supervision of the Central Board.

MR. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the Irish Loan Fund Board, which is obliged, under provisions of the 6 and 7 Vic. c. 91, s. 7, to furnish an annual Report to Parliament on or before the 31st March in each year, has failed in this duty; when will this Report be presented; and whether, having regard to the numerous instances of abuse disclosed in the working of the Irish Loan Fund system, and admitted by the right hon. Gentleman, the Government will take immediate steps in the interests of the public for the reform of this system?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The delay in furnishing the annual Report at the usual time has been caused by the additional labour falling upon the Loan Fund Board in connection with the late Committee of Inquiry. The Report, I am informed, will not be ready for presentation for some weeks to come. It will include statements concerning the new Rules, and steps taken, or decided upon, by the Board for the improved management of Loan Fund Societies.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is it proposed to publish the evidence taken at the Inquiry?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No; I do not think it will be necessary, in view of the fact that the Report is a very full Report.

MR. RICHARD M. DANE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) if he can now state what steps the Irish Government propose taking in respect of the

Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the administration of the Irish Loan Funds; and (2) what means will be adopted to protect the debenture holders in the Loan Fund Societies from the serious threatened losses by reason of this maladministration?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The first paragraph has already been answered by me in replying to the Questions of the hon. Member for South Donegal. With regard to the second paragraph, I am informed that a case raising the liability of borrowers of Loan Fund Societies, which affects, of course, the security of debenture holders, has recently been argued in the Queen's Bench Division and now awaits the decision of that Court.

MARYBOROUGH PRISON (IRELAND).

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received a statement of evidence and also a petition praying for the release of Thomas Collins, at present confined in the invalid prison of Maryborough; whether inquiries have been made in reference thereto; and whether the prisoner's release will be granted?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The statement of evidence and the petition referred to praying for the release of Convict Thomas Collins were duly received and acknowledged. After full consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the Lords Justices decided, on Friday last, that there was no ground to interfere with the sentence.

BROOKEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a case heard at the last petty sessions at Brookeborough before Mr. Jones, R.M., Sir Victor Brooke and Mr. James Beatty, in which a man named Kirkpatrick was prosecuted by the first cousin of Mr. James Beatty, J.P., for trespass in pursuit of game and was fined £3; if he is aware that Sir Victor Brooke and Mr. Jones, R.M., declined to adjudicate in the case, on the ground that it would be unseemly or illegal in them to take part in the hearing as they were members of the Hunt Club, thus leaving Mr. James Beatty to decide the case in favour of his own near relative, and to inflict the pecuniary penalty of £3; and what action will the Lord Chancellor take in the case?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: I have obtained further reports in reference to this case, from which it would appear that the trespass for which a fine of £3 was inflicted on Kirkpatrick was committed on the lands of the Rev. Mr. Clinton and prosecuted by him, and that no fine was inflicted on Kirkpatrick in respect of the trespass alleged to have been committed on the lands of Mr. Beatty, the cousin of one of the presiding Magistrates. Mr. Jones, R.M., adjudicated in the first case, and I believe Sir V. Brooke retired for the reasons stated. If Kirkpatrick is in a position to show that Mr. Beatty had such an interest in the matter as in law disqualifies a Magistrate from acting judicially, he can take proceedings to have the conviction quashed. It does not seem to be a case calling for action by the Lord Chancellor.

ARTILLERY PRACTICE (SOLENT).

SIR GEORGE BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the near approach of the season when the waters around the Isle of Wight are much frequented by yachts and passenger vessels, he can now state whether any decision has been come to in reference to the proposed bye-laws for Artillery practice over the waters of Spithead and the Solent?

MR. BRODRICK: I fear that these bye-laws will not be issued for some little time, possibly not till after the present summer. There are difficulties in the interpretation of the Acts governing ranges, and legislation may be necessary.

RADHANPUR (STATE PROPERTY).

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the indignities alleged to have been inflicted on the widow of the Nawab of Radhanpur through the Political Agent, Major Lyde, under whose orders the guards were removed from the zenana, the Begum's allowances stopped, her jewels and wardrobe seized, and property assigned to her by the will of the Nawab taken away; whether he is aware that, under the pretext of securing hidden treasures, the palace had been rudely rifled two or three times, the last occasion being so recently as the 15th April; if treasure has been found at the palace, is he satisfied that it belongs to the State, and not to the estate of the late Nawab, to be applied for purposes designated in his will; and can copies of the reports of the Political Agent, and of the memorial presented by the Begum to the Bombay Government, be laid upon the Table, together with such replies as Lord Sandhurst's Government may have recorded in reference to these transactions?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I am aware of the circumstances to which the hon. Member's Question relates. The object of the measures which have been taken was to prevent the misappropriation of property which belonged to the State of Radhanpur, and I am advised that the Government of Bombay is satisfied that the property thus recovered is State property, with the exception of certain articles which, as soon as they were proved to belong to the Hindu widow of the late Nawab, were at once restored to her. I have no reason to believe that any harsh or offensive measures were employed. When the corespondence relating to this matter is complete I will consider whether it can be laid on the Table of the House.

EXCISE PROSECUTION (MARYLEBONE).

MR. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to a Revenue prosecution for exercising the business of a compounder of cordials without a licence, heard at the Marylebone Police Court on Thursday last, when it was proved that the cordials had been manufactured for years with the knowledge of the Revenue officers, and the magistrate, in dismissing the summons with costs, observed that in the circumstances the defendant should have been warned before proceedings were taken; whether he is aware that, in many other instances, the Revenue authorities have acted in the same way in instituting prosecutions; and whether he will direct them to exercise a little more care and consideration for the future?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: My attention has been called to the case mentioned by the hon Member. I understand that the facts reported to the Board of Inland Revenue as to the operations carried on by the defendant were such as to convince them that it was a proper case for a prosecution. Had they been aware that the defendant had been carrying on the same business for some years with the knowledge of any of their officers, they would certainly have dealt with the case in a different way. But, until evidence to that effect was given in Court by one of their officers, they had no ground for thinking that this was so, and an inquiry is now being made into the matter. I am not aware of any other cases in which this has occurred, and I quite agree with the hon. Member that care should be taken to prevent its recurrence.

QUEENSLAND.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is on record at the Colonial Office a Dispatch from one of his predecessors, the Duke of Newcastle, dated 14th December 1861, asserting, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, the right to deal with the then unsettled Central and Northern Districts of Queensland as the wishes and convenience of future settlers might require, and to erect those districts into distinct colonies when found to be sufficiently advanced and populous to justify such a concession; and whether he is aware that there is a general consensus of local opinion that the time has now arrived when the conditions of progress and settlement, foreshadowed by the Duke of Newcastle at the creation of the present colony of Queensland, have been fully accomplished, and that the promise made by him on behalf of Her Majesty's Government ought to be promptly redeemed?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Dispatch referred to by the hon. Member had reference only to the area to the north of the 26th parallel of latitude and between the 141st and 138th meridians of east longitude which Queensland then wished to take over, and which was, by the Letters Patent of 13th March 1862, annexed to Queensland. The Dispatch had no reference to any question of sub-dividing Queensland, as defined by the Letters Patent of 1859.

ROMFORD RAILWAY STATION (FATAL ACCIDENT).

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade (1) whether the Inquiry, as promised, has been held relating to the accident at Romford railway station on 31st March, at which a man met his death; and, if so, with what result; (2) whether the Board of Trade have decided to recommend that in all cases where shunting operations are carried on by horses on any main line there should be two men with each pair of horses, whereas in this case there was only one; and (3) whether, seeing that the man after meeting with such a serious accident, had to be carried away on an ordinary wooden hurdle, he will endeavour to press upon the railway companies the necessity of providing a proper ambulance at all shunting stations on main lines, so that in case of accident the sufferer may be carried away without aggravated suffering?

MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir; the Board of Trade have just received the report. It recommends that consideration should be given to the necessity for providing a second man in such cases, and the recommendation will be communicated to the company. I will direct the attention of the Railway Association to the third paragraph of the hon. Member's Question.

COLLECTION OF RATES (DUBLIN).

MR. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether his attention has been drawn to the resolutions adopted by the North Dublin and South Dublin Board of Guardians, asking that Measures should be passed to enable those bodies to provide for the collection of their own rates; and (2) whether, if the Government will not itself introduce such a Measure, it will support it if introduced by a private Member?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Resolutions to the effect stated have been adopted by the local bodies referred to in the first paragraph. I have already explained that the matter is not one with which the Government can undertake to deal, and I cannot give any pledge that the Government would support such a Measure if introduced by a private Member.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (CO. MEATH).

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, what progress has been made towards carrying out the scheme for the erection of labourers' cottages in Kells, County of Meath?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Loans for the erection of 75 cottages in this Union were sanctioned by the Local Government Board in July 1896, and there are already built in the Union, under previous schemes, 231 cottages. The Board are informed by the Clerk of the Union that possession has been obtained of 41 out of the 75 sites included in the last scheme, and that contracts have been entered into by the Guardians for the erection of 20 of the cottages. Steps are also being taken by them to obtain possession of the remaining sites to enable the erection of the cottages to be proceeded with.

BLACKROCK TOWNSHIP COMMISSIONERS.

*MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury (1) if it has come to his knowledge that the Blackrock Township Commissioners are engaged in consolidating their township loans by the issue of debenture stock for the purpose of paying off £12,084 due to the Board of Works; that the Board of Works refuse to accept repayment unless on condition that for every £100 due the Blackrock Commissioners shall pay £114 10s.; (2) whether he is aware that when the loans were obtained no intimation was given that such a condition would be imposed, and that no such condition was inserted in the mortgages to the Board of Works; and (3) whether this is a legal demand by the Board of Works upon the ratepayers of Blackrock in view of the conditions of the mortgages agreed to by the Board of Works when the loans were granted?

*Mr. HANBURY: I am aware of the facts mentioned in the first paragraph, though they are stated in a somewhat misleading form, and the amount outstanding is £11,598, and not as stated in the Question. This sum represents the outstanding balances of 19 recent loans advanced by the Board of Works at different dates between 1888 and 1896, for specified periods varying from 15 to 50 years. The mortgages distinctly state that the repayments are to be spread over these periods, and there is no condition enabling the borrowers to pay them off earlier to suit their own convenience, and at the loss of nearly 15 per cent. of capital to the lenders, the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. The rule is the same for all loans, whether in England, Scotland or Ireland. So long as the market price of local loans stock is considerably above par, as at present, the solvency of the Local Loans Fund might be seriously affected by premature repayments of the loans at par only, and it is therefore the practice of the Treasury to safeguard the taxpayer by refusing to allow premature repayment at a price far below the current market price of the stock. The demand is, of course, perfectly legal.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.), who congratulated the First Lord of the Treasury on his recovery from indisposition—[*cheers*]—asked whether, considering the number of times the House has recently been counted out, and the difficulty of finding work for it, he will consider the propriety of arranging business so that Parliament may be prorogued on Jubileee Day, the 22nd June?

Mr. SYDNEY GEDGE (Walsall): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that supporters of the Government have brought in several Bills of an uncontentious character, and that last week the House was counted out twice on Government nights, there not being sufficient Government business to occupy the time, the Government will take into consideration the propriety of giving up part of their time to private Members, or at least arrange to keep a House when Bills or resolutions introduced by their supporters are under discussion?

Mr. B. L. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the fact that under the Resolution of 29th January, Fridays are allotted to the Business of Supply, whether the Government will for the future move the Adjournment of the House so soon as the business of Supply is disposed of?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I am afraid that my hon. Friend the Member for South Belfast and other hon. Members also take a much too sanguine view with regard to the business we have still to get through before the end of the Session. The House knows, roughly speaking, what that business is, and if hon. Members will take the trouble to forecast the amount of time which may be occupied over it, they will see that to prophesy the termination of the Session on June 22, or possibly even on July 22, would be to take too sanguine a view of the circumstances. My hon. Friend the Member for Walsall asks whether the Government will give up some of their time, having—not as they think—so much of it to spare, for the purpose of allowing more progress to be made with private Members' Bills. I gather that he and the hon. Member for East Islington are of opinion that on Friday nights the time not taken up by Supply might be appropriately filled up for this particular purpose. But I may remind the House that Friday night has never been given up to private Members' legislation. It has always been a Government night, subject, of course, to the claims of private Members to move resolutions on the Motion for getting the Speaker out of the Chair in order to go into Committee. When the new Friday rule was passed, the night remained a Government night, on which, after Supply was finished, Government business had precedence. An appeal was made to the Government that, in consideration of the fact that the first claim on the evening had been given to them for Supply, they would not use any portion of the night, after the disposal of Supply, for the purpose of passing their own legislation. That appeal was acceded to by the Government, and the result is that private Members have tried to fill up the vacuum after Supply has been finished, and have asked the House to consider their Bills. Now I am not sure that that is a convenient plan. ["Hear, hear!"] It forces private Members to watch for legislation on Friday, and to come down to the House in case any private Members' Bills should be reached. I think we should carry out the spirit of the sessional order much better by keeping Friday night for Supply only. ["Hear, hear!"] Then the question may be asked, why the Government do not put down enough Supply on Friday so as to prevent the possibility of a count-out; and of course they could, if they liked, put down as effective Supply all the Supply still left for consideration. I have deliberately abstained from that course for this reason: I feel that if we were to put down too much Supply, we should probably get not more, but fewer Votes, for Members would probably be under the impression that the Government intended to take advantage of them, and Members interested in remote Votes would feel bound to come to the House on the chance that those Votes might be reached. Therefore, I have aimed at putting down only a reasonable amount of Supply on Fridays, and I still think that that is the more convenient course. ["Hear, hear!"] Although it may, perhaps, seem to the public outside that a count on Friday night at 10 or 11 o'clock is a waste of public time, I think it really is not so, and that we get through the business more quickly by the arrangement which I have endeavoured to carry out than we should by any other. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore, I shall continue, subject to what I may hear, with the plan I have adopted with regard to the amount of Supply to be put down on Fridays. But I think it would be an improvement if, henceforth, when the Votes have been disposed of, we were to move the adjournment of the House. [*Cheers.*]

SIR BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether an opportunity of concluding the Debate on Vote 10, Class I., Civil Service Estimates (Ordnance Survey), which Debate was not concluded when the House rose on the morning of Saturday 10th April, will be given; and, if so, whether he can say when that date will be?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I cannot promise my hon. Friend that any further opportunity will be given for the discussion of this Vote. A certain amount of discussion upon it has already been taken, and until I can better foresee the course of business I cannot give any undertaking on the subject.

WAR RISKS (NATIONAL INSURANCE).

MR. H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Defence Committee has yet framed any scheme for the national insurance of British ships and cargoes against war risks in time of war; and, if so, whether the arrangements made will be communicated to the public, so as to avoid panic and maintain confidence in the event of an outbreak of war?

SIR G. BADEN-POWELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Defence Committee has power to enact any such scheme, and whether it is not necessary to obtain Parliamentary sanction for a financial scheme of such importance?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The Defence Committee have no legislative powers, of course, and I imagine that all they could do if public funds were required for any purpose such as that suggested by my hon. Friend would be to come to Parliament for the necessary powers. We have prepared no plan for the purpose referred to in the Question on the Paper, but I think the matter is one of great interest, and does deserve the attention of the Defence Committee. ["Hear, hear!"]

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS (PENSIONS FUND).

MR. D. H. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the advanced state of the Government business, he will be able, this Session, to bring in a Bill to provide a pension fund for teachers?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: In view of the large amount of time which has already been occupied during the present Session by subjects connected with elementary education, I cannot hold out any very sanguine hope to my hon. Friend that this question, the great importance of which the Government fully recognise, can be adequately dealt with this year.

TURCO-GREEK WAR.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I should like to be allowed to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is in a position to make any statement to the House as to any communications that may have passed between the Greek Government and the Powers?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir. As, I think, the right hon. Gentleman will readily be in a position to conjecture, it would not be expedient while negotiations are pending to make any statement.

MR. MORLEY: May we suppose from that that negotiations are pending?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: Yes, Sir that is so.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. J. MORLEY asked what business it was proposed to take on Thursday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I cannot really say what business will be taken on Thursday until I know what progress we shall make tonight. I should hope that we shall finish the Budget Resolutions to-night, and in that case the morning sitting tomorrow will be devoted to the next stage of the Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, with the Metropolitan Police-courts Bill as second Order, and the Post Office Consolidation Bill third. If we do not succeed in passing the Budget Resolutions to-night, some of that business will have to be postponed till Thursday.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked whether it was intended to proceed that night with the fourth Order of the Day, the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill?

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked whether, in view of the action of the Government with regard to the money allocated to Ireland in 1896, the right hon. Gentleman would state what were the intentions of the Government as to proceeding with the Bill just mentioned and the Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: If both hon. Members will be kind enough to defer their Questions till Thursday I will then try to answer them.

MR. LOUGH: I understand that no progress will be attempted to be made with the Bills until the Government have made up their minds on the financial question?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. (MORNING SITTINGS ON TUESDAY).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY moved: "That, unless the House otherwise order, the House do meet on Tuesdays at two of the clock." He said: I think on all sides of the House it will be felt that Tuesdays ought to be more utilised than they are at present for getting through the necessary business of the Session. Some of my critics might say that I ought to take the whole of Tuesdays, and it is not impossible that at a later date I may have to come to this House and ask for such facilities; but I am reluctant to do so. I therefore content myself now with proposing this Resolution, which is moved this year at a later period than in the previous Session. There have been several Tuesdays of late during the earlier part of which we have had some interesting discussions, and during the remainder of which the House enjoyed a greater amount of leisure than usual. I hope the House will feel that we are making no undue call on the time of private Members when we come on May 12 to ask them to give up some part of their privileges.

MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Walsall) said he would much rather that the Government should ask the House to give up the whole of Tuesday than that they should inflict upon hon. Members the burden of morning sittings. These morning sittings were all very well for Members from Ireland who came over here and left their businesses behind them, and also for Members from Scotland; but for commercial and professional men in London they were very objectionable. They found it almost impossible to attend them, and he was afraid his right hon. Friend must make up his mind to see the Government majority somewhat reduced on these occasions. He would far rather see private Members killed than compelled to commit suicide. What hon. Members having been in the House from two o'clock to seven would take the trouble to come down again at nine o'clock for private Members' business? He thought private Members might have a little more consideration shown to them in those matters. What the constituencies really wanted was the Bills introduced by private Members, and yet the Bill promoted by his hon. Friend the Member for East Somerset was counted out the other night when there were enough Members of the Government behind the Speaker's chair to make a House. ["Hear, hear!"] For these reasons he certainly hoped the Government would very soon take the whole of Tuesdays.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

The following notices stood upon the Paper:—

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Rochester): On Order for Committee on Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill being read, to move:—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions enabling the Education Department to check, if they think fit, the increase of the sum expended per scholar for maintenance under any School Board receiving a contribution under this Bill."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorgan, Mid): On Order for Committee on Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill being read, to move:—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert clauses in the Bill with a view to provide that payment may be made to School Boards of all arrears which may remain unpaid of the sums to which such School Boards would have been entitled to receive under Section 97 of the Elementary Education Act 1870, if the said Boards had made application therefor to the Education Department from year to year as such sums became due and payable."

*MR. SPEAKER said that the Instruction to the Committee which the noble Lord the Member for Rochester had given notice to enable the Education Department to check the increase of the sum expended per scholar for maintenance under any School Board receiving a contribution under the Bill was out of order, because its object might be obtained by an Amendment. The other Instruction standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Glamorganshire, providing for the payment of arrears under Section 97 of the Act of 1870, was also out of order, because its object was to increase the grant which was voted in Committee, and it would be quite out of order as an Instruction.

[While Mr. Speaker was delivering the above ruling, several Members passed down the floor of the House amid cries of "Order!"]

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is not one of the Standing Orders of the House that when you rise in the Chair every Member should remain seated? ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. SPEAKER: That is the Rule, and it is important in the interests of the order and decency of the proceedings of the House that it should be observed.

Bill considered in Committee.

[The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

POWER TO INCREASE GRANT UNDER 33 & 34 VICT. C. 75. S. 97.

(1.) Section ninety-seven of the Elementary Education Act 1870, shall have effect as if the sum of seven shillings and sixpence therein mentioned were increased by the sum of *fourpence* for every complete penny by which the School Board rate for the year therein mentioned exceeded threepence. Provided that the said sum of seven shillings and sixpence shall not be thereby increased beyond a maximum of *sixteen shillings and sixpence.*

(2.) "School Board rate" means the rate in the pound on the rateable value of the district which would have produced the sum required in the said year for the purpose of the annual expenses of the Board, and actually paid in that year to the treasurer by the rating authority.

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) moved in Sub-section (2), after the word "required," to insert the words, "and actually paid to the Treasurer." He said he desired by the Amendment to make the meaning of the clause quite clear. Sub-section (2) stated that the School Board rate meant the rate which would have produced the sum required in the said year; but, as a rule, the rate was 1-12th more than was actually paid to the Treasurer. Therefore he wished to transpose the words, "and actually paid to the Treasurer." He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would recognise that this Amendment was necessary.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University) said he was informed by his professional adviser that the form in which the Clause was drawn was now clear.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR J. GORST said the Government proposed the following Amendment to meet the question of balance:—

"In calculating for the purpose of Section 97 of the Act the annual expenses of the School Board, the Education Act shall include such sum as is necessary for maintaining such working balance as the Education Department determine to be necessary."

The effect of the Amendment would be that a Board would be able to carry a reasonable balance over to the next year as part of its necessary expenses. He suggested that the Amendment should be discussed on Report.

MR. A. H. DYKE ACLAND (York, W.R., Rotherham) said that this showed that the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Channing) was a genuine one. He had no doubt that the words of the Government Amendment, when they came to be read, would prove satisfactory to the School Boards throughout the country.

MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) said he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the spirit in which he had dealt with this matter.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) expressed the hope that before the Report stage the Vice President would reconsider the terms of his Amendment so that the amount by which any balance in the hands of a School Board at the beginning of a year exceeded the amount of the balance at the close of the year might be regarded as equivalent to an amount contributed out of the rates during the year, and to that extent influence the grant under the Bill.

MR. A. J. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside) thought the Vice President of the Council had met the case very fairly, but that at the same time he might have converted the first "may" into "shall."

SIR J. GORST took it that this was one of the cases in which "may" should mean "shall," but in order to put all doubt at an end he would move the Amendment in the suggested amended form. ["Hear, hear!"] He was afraid the present Amendment would not meet such a case as that the hon. Member for West Ham had put.

*SIR C. DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said that, personally, he should have been content if the right hon. Gentleman had, without putting an Amendment in the Bill, given them a promise as regarded the practice of the Department, because he could not but think that the practice of the Department in the particular case which had been brought to the knowledge of hon. Members by means of a circular was wrong and illegal. He thought it would have satisfied the authorities concerned if the Vice President had told the Committee that the practice in this matter would be made straight. He did not think the practice had been uniformly wrong; indeed, his impression was that in other cases the matter had been fairly dealt with.

*MR. GRAY said that he must press his right hon. Friend. In many districts the matter he had drawn attention to had given much trouble. The School Board year closed on September 29th, and very probably on the 30th the School Board had to meet very large claims. If the rating authority could not pay the School Board on the morning of the 30th sums sufficient to meet those claims, the School Board must carry over from the 29th a sufficient sum to meet the claims, hence the necessity for an actual working balance. He feared that in many places the School Boards might be put on the 30th of September in the position of defaulters unless they kept fairly large balances.

Mr. CHANNING said the junior Member for Halifax had handed him a statement respecting the Halifax School Board which raised the question of the interpretation the Education Department would put upon the words "reasonable balance." The clerk to the Board wrote:—

> "Taking, for instance, the case of our own Board (our financial year ends March 25), on September 29, 1896, the balance in hand happened to be £2,663, the amount of rate levied £20,975; but, according to the proposal of the Government, as our Board understands it, the amount of aid under the new Bill would be calculated only upon £18,312. In the previous year, at the same date, it happened that the Board had at its bankers the very large balance of £11,630, and if the aid to be given had been calculated upon the difference between the rate levied and this chance balance no grant at all would have been due under the provisions of this Bill."

It was quite evident they required a litle more enlightenment as to what would be the standard or the principle upon which the Education Department would attempt to determine this very difficult question.

Sir J. GORST could not help thinking that with a little more care the balances might be made rather more uniform than the hon. Member had shown those at Halifax to have been. What the Department would do would be to seek to prevent a School Board from keeping such a balance as would really defeat the intention of the Act. There would be no desire to restrain the necessary variations in the amounts, or, in other words, to interfere with local finance; but the Department would, of course, enable a School Board to keep such balances as were necessary.

*Sir JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) said it would, perhaps, be better to defer the discussion of the Amendment until they had seen the actual words; but he would ask the Vice President to consider the point raised by the hon. Member for West Ham. He did not quite gather the reason which induced the right hon. Gentleman to prefer his own Amendment to that proposed by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire. Personally, he should have thought it would have been more convenient to leave out both balances and deal with the actual expenditure. It stood to reason that there might be cases connected with the erection of new schools and other matters which might make a balance reasonable one year, while it would be unreasonable another year. This and other points deserved careful consideration, but, at the same time, they could not discuss them with advantage without having seen the actual words of the Amendment proposed by his right hon. Friend.

Amendment, as amended, put and agreed to.

On the Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,"

Mr. ACLAND said it did not follow that if he and others had not put down Amendments, they were in any sense satisfied with the clause as one calculated to assist School Boards. In a money Bill of this sort, the House of Commons was not able to settle the amount of money which it thought fit should be granted to the ratepayers for their schools. They had to accept from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the sum he thought fit to name, and they must take it or leave it, although they might disapprove of the general relief which it gave. Therefore, as it was perfectly obvious that £110,000 was better than nothing, they must not vote against the clause—[*ironical Ministerial cheers*]—but it was only from that point of view that the clause could be accepted by many of those who were interested in School Boards. Speaking broadly, he should say that nobody supposed that the School Boards themselves were satisfied with the amount which was supposed to relieve their necessities, and which only gave them 1s. per child as compared with the 5s. per child which the House had already granted to the Voluntary or non-Board Schools. If they took the School Boards numerically, they saw how very few of them, though bearing a large burden of rates, got any advantage whatever under this clause. There were 2,500 Boards in the country, and it was said that nearly 800 Boards got relief under the clause. That was true in a nominal sense, but 25 per cent. of them got less than £10, so that they might be eliminated as getting practically no relief. Then another 25 per cent. got more than £10, but less than £50, and, except in the case of a few country parishes, a sum of less than £50 was practically no relief at all. So that half of them got practically what was no relief at all, and out of the 2,500 only 300 or 400 got any effective relief, and in the large districts, whether they got sums of £50 or £200, the amount of relief was entirely inadequate. They had heard again and again that this was a Bill to relieve the necessities of poor School Boards. Did it do that from the point of view of those who bore the burden of the rates? He thought everybody who watched the working of Section 97 must come to the conclusion that that Section was a very inadequate machine for the purpose of meeting necessities, and unfortunately it had been taken as the basis for further relief rather than that the subject should have been grappled in some new form, and by a completely new Act of Parliament. This left an enormous number of inequalities, which would be seen more and more as years went on, and which must arise from this clause when it became part of an Act of Parliament. They knew from the Return the Vice President had given that, while there were schools with only a 4d., 5d., or 6d. rate which would get grants, schools paying a 10d., 11d., and 1s. rate would get nothing whatever. No explanation based on the difference of rateable value, or the difference between what was called a rich town and a poor town, could possibly adequately get rid of the extreme inequalities which arose under the clause. He did not think anybody could be surprised that even large towns which were deeply attached to the present Government through their representatives in that House were extremely dissatisfied with the clause as it stood. The Birmingham School Board had, with only one dissentient, resolved that the clause was thoroughly unsatisfactory to them. Nobody could be surprised at this when a place had devoted itself to education as Birmingham had, and when, though it was paying a 1s. rate, it got nothing whatever, whereas, if it had been paid 5s. per head as well as the Voluntary Schools, it would have received no less than £12,000 a year. That was a very heavy penalty to place on Birmingham, which had stood in the van in many respects among English towns. Bradford, too, was in very much the same position. It simply remained for them to say that the provision now made was full of inequalities from the point of view of relieving the necessities of ratepayers and, on its own principle, that there was no kind of permanence in it.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that he entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend, that the relief afforded by this Bill was absolutely inadequate and almost insulting to the School Boards of the country. But he wanted to ask the Government whether they could not go a step further and bring in an Amendment to the clause on the Report stage which would enable the Education Department to give to School Boards the arrears that were already due to them under Section 97, but which they neglected to apply for when the money was due to them? The amount of unclaimed grants due to these small and poorer School Boards was something like £14,000, of which £4,000 were due to the poorest School Boards in Wales. The Vice President stated in the House a few weeks ago that he was advised by the Law Officers that he could not give more than one year's arrears, but a very simple addition to this clause would enable the Government to take to themselves power to give the whole of the arrears to those School Boards to which they were due. He would ask the Vice President whether the Government would take that most reasonable course?

*MR. ERNEST GRAY said that there was one point he would like to raise, though the Vice President might think he was unduly anxious. He would remind his right hon. Friend and the Committee that there would be no payments made under this Act until October next, and if they could, by a word or two from the Vice President, clear away the anxiety which would exist between now and then, perhaps the Committee would not think the few moments wasted. He referred to this question of the rate in the pound and the rateable value. He would admit that his own anxiety had been removed by the answers the Vice President had given him on various occasions, but the words of the Bill were not clear. The words "rateable value" were used outside by rating authorities and by School Boards in some four or five different senses, and considerable anxiety had been experienced as to what the Department understood the term rateable value to mean. If the grants under the

Act were to be paid in accordance with the rate in the pound on the gross rateable value of the district, then there would be a very material difference between the sums so paid, and the amounts which would be paid if the net rateable value of the district were meant. ["Hear, hear!"] He understood the operation under the Act would be this, that after a closed rate was formed, the rating authority would know exactly what one penny in the pound would produce. That was excluding from the gross rateable value the cost of collecting, loss by compounding, empties, and various other items of that nature. In the poorer districts, this meant a very material difference indeed. In West Ham it meant a difference of nearly 1s. per child between the rate on the net rateable value and the rate on the gross rateable value. He understood the Vice President to say that it was the intention of the Department that it should be the net rateable value, and if he would state that in his place it would remove a very large amount of uneasiness which otherwise would undoubtedly prevail between the passing of the Act and its first application in October next. He was not alone amongst those who desired to have a clear, definite and explicit interpretation given to the words of a very abstruse clause. This difficulty did exist outside, and he hoped the Vice President would by a word or two clear that misapprehension away and relieve the anxiety of those who were looking forward with some pleasure to the operation of this Act.

*Sir C. DILKE said his final grumble at this clause concerned the maximum which had been placed in the Bill. He had been unable to understand why that maximum had been placed in the Bill. A sliding scale which became a more operative scale as poverty increased, ought logically, and in the nature of things, to have no maximum. The case of the Government for the maximum in this clause was that the particular point fixed was not likely to be reached. He was not so sure of that. There was a particular parish which he had in his view, in which the fall of the rateable value had been very rapid, and the rates had increased in three successive half years—7s., 8s., and from 8s. to 9s. That was entirely caused by the fall in the rateable value, and therefore he was bound to say that the maximum which the Government, though they had put it in the Bill, believed would never be reached, would really be reached in some cases.

Mr. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he agreed with the hon. Member for West Ham as to the extreme necessity for making it clear whether the calculation as to the threepenny rate was on the gross rateable value or on the nett rateable value. In almost all public offices the calculation as to what a threepenny rate would produce was based on the nett rateable value, and that, of course, was a different thing from what a threepenny rate would produce in collection, especially in the poorer districts, where it varied from time to time. Therefore when they spoke of a threepenny rate it should be made clear whether it meant a rate calculated by the method adopted by the Local Government Board and other public offices, or meant the actual produce of a threepenny rate.

*Sir W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said he rose to challenge the statement made by his right hon. Friend the Member for Rotherham in regard to the educational position that had brought about the introduction of the Bill. His right hon. Friend seemed to have forgotten what the position of affairs was at the last general election in regard to the Voluntary Schools and the Board Schools of the country. At that election it was pointed out by Unionist candidates in all constituencies, town and country, that there was such a difference between the monetary aid given by the rates to the Board Schools and to the Voluntary Schools that unless something was done to reduce the inequality by means of a Government grant, the almost immediate extinction of the voluntary system would result, and it was in pursuance of the pledges then given that the Voluntary Schools Act had been passed and that this Bill was also introduced. The constituencies were appealed to on behalf of the Voluntary Schools, and they replied that something should be done for those schools. Therefore it was not fair for hon. Members opposite to try to establish a grievance because of the difference between the sum given to the Voluntary Schools and the sum given to the Board Schools, as no question had been presented to the constituencies in regard to the Board Schools at the general election. But he thought that hon. Members opposite had a right to demand that where a district was so poor that a good Board School could not be maintained, that a sufficient sum should be found by the State to secure adequate education for the children of that district, and if the Bill did not bring about that object, the Government would be wise even at that stage to listen to an Amendment moved in that direction. But the Bill was never intended to be a ratepayers' relief Bill. If the School Board rate was oppressive, the ratepayers had the relief in their own hands. So long as they returned to the School Board educational enthusiasts who spent the rates lavishly, they had no ground to come to Parliament and ask for relief.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he desired to enter a mild protest against the historic account given by his right hon. Friend both as to the general election and the intentions of this Bill. He had read many articles and speeches dealing with the reasons which had given the other side their majority at the last general election. He had always supposed that it was high Imperial considerations that had placed the Government in power—such as the profound dissatisfaction with the administrative and the legislative programmes of the late Liberal Government; the determination to uphold the integrity of the Empire, and to protect certain interests—some secular and some spiritual—which were supposed to be gravely menaced. But he had never before heard the victory of the Government attributed to an invincible desire on the part of the constituencies of the country to remedy the grievances—the undoubted grievances, he admitted—of the Voluntary Schools. His right hon. Friend had also said the Bill was never intended to be a ratepayers' relief Bill. If a true biography of the Bill could be written, or if some future correspondence disclosed its genesis, its production, modification and final settlement, they should have an extraordinary history indeed. He believed the taxpayers of the country were quite as much alive to the relief of the ratepayers as to the relief of the subscribers to Voluntary Schools; that they would regard a Bill as unjust, and he believed they would take an early opportunity of rectifying the mistake of the Government in treating the Voluntary Schools and the Board Schools differently—not to the disadvantage of the Voluntary Schools, but in order to do justice to the ratepayers. He should not have revived those controversies if his right hon. Friend had not entered a protest against the statements on that side of the House in reference to the injustice of the Bill, for if they were to remain silent it might be assumed that they accepted the protest of his right hon. Friend. When the time came—it would not be in the House—he would be prepared to justify up to the hilt all that had been said, not only against the injustice, but against the impolicy of this Bill. Coming to details, he thought it was right that they should have some definition as to what the Government meant in reference to the vexed question of rateable value. He would point out to his hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch that there was no such thing as gross rateable value and nett rateable value; but there was gross rental and nett rateable value. Take a rateable value of £240,000 a year. A rate of 3d. in the pound would not produce in that case £3,000. It would require a much larger rate to produce that sum, because there were a large number of properties in this country, both urban and rural, in regard to which rates were compounded for, and where, of course, a large reduction had to be made. There was also a considerable leakage from houses empty and from bad debts, and these made a very appreciable difference in the produce of a rate. What they wanted to understand was, did the Government mean that the rate, if everybody paid up to the full, with no bad debts, and no compounding, would be a rate of 3d. in the pound, or did they mean such a rate as would produce the sum mentioned in this Bill? He thought the right hon. Gentleman should make it perfectly clear what was the intention of the Government, lest some future critic, or rather obstructive, in the Education Department, should put a construction upon the Act which was not intended.

Sir J. GORST said he did not complain at all of the right hon. Member for

Rotherham making a protest which he unfortunately was not able to make on the Second Reading, but he did not think it would be very proper for them to indulge in another Second Reading Debate at this stage. He rose to answer some of the questions put to him; the most important question was that which had just been put by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He thought he had some right to complain of this question, as it had been put formerly by notice and answered in the most ample and clear manner, which not only he himself but the Committee of Council of Education had been able to suggest. There was no doubt whatever that the rate mentioned in the 97th section of the Act of 1870, and the rate mentioned in this Bill, was not, as the hon. Member for Shoreditch suggested, any imaginary or conventional rate; it was the rate which would actually produce the sum which was required. He hoped he had stated that clearly—["hear, hear!"]—but if there was any doubt about it, and anybody wanted to have a further or clearer statement, the best way would be to put a Question on the Paper. The Question would then be carefully considered, and the answer could be framed in legal language. That, he thought, was the only question of real importance which had been put in the course of this short discussion. Several other questions had been put, notably by the hon. and learned Member for Glamorganshire, with a view of trying to persuade the Government at a later stage to increase the relief which was given in this Bill. He heard all these sort of appeals without any emotion whatever—[*laughter*]—because he was in the position of the traveller with empty pockets who sang in the presence of a robber. [*Laughter.*] The House knew very well that he could not make grants of money, and that there was an authority higher than he. He had no power to propose Amendments which would enlarge the scope of this Bill. That was his answer to the proposal for including arrears. And so, with regard to the maximum, he could only say, "There it is." [*Laughter.*] He still thought it was a maximum which would not be reached, but if in time to come the maximum should ever be reached, he had no doubt that the wisdom of Parliament would devise some other means. He thought, on the whole, the Committee must admit that, as far as the money at the disposal of the Education Department had gone, it had been as wisely and successfully distributed as was possible. A great many cases of course were always brought up of hardship; some of them had been brought up more than once—the case of Aston, for instance. He had already dealt with this matter, however, on the Second Reading. He hoped the House would now allow the clause to pass.

Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2,—

COMMENCEMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND SHORT TITLE.

This Act shall, from and after the *twenty-ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven,* be construed as part of section ninety-seven of the Elementary Education Act 1870, and shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland, and may be cited as the Elementary Education Act 1897.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Rochester) rose to move the following new clause:—

CONTROL OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OVER RATE OF EXPENDITURE.

"The standard of rate expenditure in any school year at any school provided by a School Board receiving a contribution under this Act shall not, without the consent of the Education Department, exceed the standard of rate expenditure at such school during the school year last concluded; and no School Board shall, without such consent, receive from the rating authority for maintenance a larger sum than is sufficient, together with the contribution under this Act, to meet a rate expenditure according to such standard. The expression 'standard of rate expenditure' means the sum arrived at by dividing the amount received in any school from the rates and from any contribution under this Act and expended for the purposes of annual maintenance in any school year by the number of scholars in average attendance at such school during that year."

He said most people were under the impression that this Bill was intended for the relief of poverty-stricken districts, and the terms of the Bill had taken them rather by surprise. As a matter of fact, a very much larger number of School Boards were included in the scope of the Bill than could in any way be described as being in poverty-stricken districts. He did not object to the Bill on that ground. The Bill was introduced for the relief of the rates. ["Hear, hear!"] That was the reason put forward, he thought, by the Government, and certainly by numbers of Gentlemen supporting the Government. The question was, did many of the School Boards about to be relieved show in any sense that they felt the pressure of the rates? If so, they would have expected them to keep down the cost of education to a reasonable limit, and not to run into unnecessary luxury and extravagance as many of them had done. The Forest of Dean did not give cheap education, it was £2 6s. a head there; in Walthamstow it was as much as £2 8s. a head. These districts were going to be very heavily assisted under the Bill. In Leicester it was £2 7s. a head; in Gateshead £2 9s. This cost, moreover, was rising every day. Since 1891 the cost of education in the Borough of Nottingham had risen from £2 5s. to £2 11s. a head; in Leeds from £2 6s. to £2 11s. 6d.; and in West Ham from £2 9s. 6d. to £3 0s. 1d. He took his figures from the return which the Government had presented. It was very strange that School Boards which came for assistance to the Exchequer, should have a very expensive education, the cost of which was increasing year by year in this manner. Many of the School Boards in the large towns were not content to give merely a good education. If the West Ham School Board would limit its expenditure to £2 5s. per head, the School Board rate in West Ham would be reduced by 6½d. in the pound. Let the West Ham School Board give as good an education as they pleased, but when they voted money for School Boards who thought fit to spend money in this way, there was no assurance that the money would go to the relief of the ratepayers. Why should not any of these School Boards raise the expenditure still further? The West Ham School Board had not reached the London School Board figure of £3 7s. It might establish a higher grade school—or go in for specific subjects after the fashion of the London School Board. It might teach "the nature of hydrogen, its preparation, properties, and combustion; coal gas, its explosive powers; atmospheric air, carbonic gas in air, its use in plants; water ebullition, air pressure, boiling point, water apparently boiled by cooling, effect of sodium upon it." The teacher of these subjects was a sanguine man. He was of opinion that this instruction was not altogether thrown away, and said that girls who remaned two or three years in the classes always showed improvement, and in some cases they remembered well what they had learnt—perhaps 18 months afterwards. [*Laughter.*] If the House was going to vote this large sum of money because some girls remembered the nature of boiling point 18 months after they left school, the ratepayers would not be relieved and the money would be entirely wasted. Was there anything in the terms and conditions of the Bill which would lead School Boards to be economical? The conditions which determined whether a School Board was to receive assistance under the Bill or not were threefold. They did not depend merely on the number of the children or the wealth of the district —those were the principles upon which the old clause of 1897 was constructed—but they also depended on the height of the rates. The Nottingham School Board received substantial assistance, while the Sunderland Board received hardly anything at all. One of the reasons was that Nottingham gave a more expensive education. So, in order to get money from Parliament, there was a direct incentive to spend money. West Ham received 7s. and East Ham 4s., the reason that West Ham got most being that there 7s. per child was spent more than in East Ham. Every penny that the Leeds School Board added to the School Board rate would produce more than it had hitherto produced, because it would receive corresponding assistance from Parliament. So West Ham would receive 14 per cent. more and the Forest of Dean 25 per cent. more. The School Board of the Forest of Dean would be more than human if it did not raise its rates after the passing of this Bill. The Bill would offer a direct incentive to School Boards to raise their rates, because it would be remunerative to them to do so. He moved the new clause, because precaution should be taken that the money voted by the House did not go in unnecessary expenditure, but in relief of the taxpayer. Then the interests of the Voluntary Schools had to be considered. This Bill and the Voluntary Schools Bill should be considered together as forming one scheme on the part of the Government. He regretted that they had to discuss the sum devoted to the Board Schools from the point of view of Voluntary Schools. But this was because of the method which the Government had adopted through no fault of their own. They had said, "Let the Voluntary Schools look to the Imperial taxes as compensation for the advantage the Board Schools have from the rates." The friends of Voluntary Schools, therefore, looked with the greatest jealousy upon any special sum of money to be devoted to School Boards out of Imperial taxes, because it would clearly diminish the competitive power of the Voluntary Schools. For example, Yorkshire had a large number of School Boards which would be assisted under the Bill and receive a larger sum of money for education than they otherwise would, and this would enable them to compete much more successfully with the Voluntary Schools, and the competitive power of the latter schools would be correspondingly diminished. Parliament intended the money voted under this Bill to be for the relief of the rates, and he proposed by the clause to give the Education Department power to see that the money went as Parliament directed. He should have been better pleased if the power could be given to the county and District Councils, which were representative of the ratepayers. He suggested that course, but for obvious reasons it was ruled out of order. Under the circumstances there was a good logical reason why the Education Department should be the controlling authority, and he was supported by a precedent set by the Vice President of the Council, who had inserted an Amendment in the Bill giving the Department control, to some extent, over the expenditure of the Boards. The clause was an extension of the same principle, and was intended to give Parliament the control over School Board expenditure which it ought to have. ["Hear, hear!"] Unless some clause of this kind were accepted he was confident the only result of the Bill would be in an enormous number of cases to raise still further expenditure which had already run to extreme limits in a large number of School Boards, and the ratepayers would be no better off than they were at the present moment. He begged to move that the clause be Read a Second time.

Sir J. GORST, in resisting the Amendment, pointed out that, even if the clause were passed, the Education Department would not exercise control over all School Board expenditure, but only over the expenditure of those which were subject to the operations of the Bill, and which composed a fraction only of the School Boards of the country. It was quite clear that the proper people to exercise control over the expenditure of the School Boards were the ratepayers. ["Hear, hear!"] They had the most complete power of electing persons on the School Board to represent them, in whom they had confidence, and he could not say he felt any strong sympathy with them if, having the power to protect themselves, they did not exercise it. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not think the particular class of school to which the Amendment applied was that which required control from the central Department, nor did he think the central Department would undertake to exercise it. What was practically suggested was that the Education Department should fix for every School Board district in the country the proper amount per scholar to expend. [Viscount Cranborne dissented.] It was the expenditure per scholar that was controlled, and which was not to be increased without the consent of the Department. That would involve in the case of each School Board that came under the clause the consideration of what was the proper rate to be expended. That was a matter which it was quite impossible for the Education Department or a central office in London to decide. As he had often tried to explain, the rate of expenditure, quite irrespective of the efficiency of the school, varied enormously in different places, and the greatest expenditure per scholar was not where they had the great schools, but in the small, scattered, poor parishes where, perhaps, only 20 children had to be provided for by one master or mistress, and where, consequently, the rate of expenditure per child ran up to an amount far in excess of what it did in West Ham, London, or in great cities. ["Hear, hear!"] Another thing to be remembered was that the rate of expenditure really did not depend upon any determination made either by the School Board or the Education Department. They could not fix their rate of expenditure—because it depended upon economic considerations—upon the laws of supply and demand. The great cause of the increase of expenditure was the increase of teachers' salaries. Teachers' salaries depended upon the economic law of supply and demand, and all the regulations of the Education Department and School Boards throughout the country would not prevent the alteration of these economic laws. If the demand for teachers was great and the supply was small, the salaries must necessarily increase. The noble lord was mistaken in supposing that the cost of education depended upon the kind of education given in their great schools. Leeds was a town which received assistance under this Bill, and the noble Lord had alluded to the fact that Leeds had a higher grade school. Yes, it had; but that higher grade school was no burden to the ratepayers. Indeed, so far from being a burden to the ratepayers, it was a profit. They had an immense demand in great towns for secondary education. They had nobody there to supply it except the School Board, which had undoubtedly the means of investing the capital of the ratepayers in secondary education; fees were charged, the people were glad to pay, and actually a profit was made for the ratepayers of Leeds by the fact that the School Board discharged the function of providing secondary education. ["Hear, hear!"] No mistake could be greater than to imagine that because a place gave a high education and efficient instruction to the children, that therefore the expenditure was extravagant, or that a reduction of that education would lessen the expense. ["Hear, hear!"] He agreed with the noble Lord in the statement that children left school too early. They were now turned out of school in many cases at 11 years of age. He admitted the force of that objection, which he should remedy, not by reducing the quality of the education, but by keeping the children longer at school. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not seen his way to accept this Amendment, which carried out what was intended by the Bill, and gave an absolute guarantee that the money voted under it should go to the relief of the ratepayers. He could not understand the ground upon which the right hon. Gentleman refused to accept the Amendment. He had told them the Government could not accept the new clause because it would be giving the Department control only over a small fraction of the School Boards' expenditure. But the reason why such control should be given over that small fraction was that in these limited cases an extra grant was to be made, and for a special purpose. For his part he should certainly be glad to see some limit put to the expenses of School Boards, either by the control of the Department, or, if that was impossible, by local bodies. Surely when an extra grant was being given for a special purpose it was not seeking too much to ask that the Department should have the right to control the expenditure if they thought proper, and to see that the money was devoted to the purpose for which Parliament intended it. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the Department could not do it. Why were they incompetent? They were not incompetent to see that a large number of conditions were fulfilled in the case of the Voluntary Schools which got relief under the Voluntary Schools Act, and if they interposed those conditions in that Act as a guarantee for its doing what Parliament intended, why was it not right and proper, and why were the Education Department incompetent to see that conditions were fulfilled in this Bill to carry out the intentions of Parliament? The Duke of Devonshire, replying to a deputation at the Foreign Office on the 26th February, said that the matter with which the present Bill dealt was almost entirely a ratepayers' question. That being so, he asked the Committee to regard it as a ratepayers' question, and see that the money went to the relief of the ratepayers. Neither he nor the noble Lord desired to bar the rogress of education; nothing was fur-her from their wishes. They had the uthority of the Duke of Devonshire him-elf, and of everybody who had discussed he Bill, for saying that it was not a Measure for the furtherance or efficiency f education, but merely for the relief f ratepayers. That being so he asked hy should they not try to see that that bject was carried out. If the clause vere adopted it would not in any way mpede the progress of education. It vas really permissive. It said that the Education Department might limit the ate of expenditure if it thought fit, and aw sufficient reasons for it. They had o look at this Bill from the point of view of the Voluntary Schools Bill. In the latter Bill they tried to make up the normous disparities which existed be-ween the cost of each child in the Voluntary and the Board Schools, by iving the Voluntary Schools 5s. per head. Parliament had endeavoured to make up the disparity of 11s. between the cost of ducation in Board and in Voluntary chools by giving 5s. per scholar to the atter. But if they allowed the money ranted by this Bill, which averaged 1s. er scholar in attendance in Board chools, to be used in creating fresh com-etiton with Voluntary Schools, the re-ult would be that the advantage which Voluntary Schools would receive would nly represent 4s. per scholar. There ere cases where School Boards had de-ermined to try and drive Voluntary chools out of existence by unfair com-etition. ["Oh!"] Having tried to stop that by giving a small grant to Voluntary chools, were they now going to put noney into the pockets of certain School Boards in order that they might use it o renew that competition? ["Hear, ear!"] He would support the Amend-nent because it carried out the policy f the Government—the maintenance of he dual system of education in this ountry.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Ham-ts, Poplar) said the amount involved in he Bill was equal only to about the verage annual increase in the School Board rate. Therefore the additional ompetition which it would create was ractically infinitesimal.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: In par-icular cases it is by no means in-nitesimal.

MR. BUXTON said it would be found that the grant under the Bill would go chiefly to places where competition was least felt. With the exception of one or two places like West Ham and Tottenham, where they might take it for granted that a large amount of the money would go in relief of rates, very few of the great School Boards would be able by means of this grant to burst out into wild and overwhelming extravagance. In his opinion, the way to improve national education in this country was not by curtailing the powers of expenditure upon that education. They must in this matter trust the ratepayers. If in some cases the ratepayers were apathetic that was their affair; and it was for the noble Lord and his friends to stir them up, and to induce them to protest against the burden of the rate. Taking the system of education throughout, he denied that the School Boards were extravagant. The bulk of the expenditure was forced upon them. In many cases the ratepayers were unwilling to spend these large sums, and only sanctioned them because of the necessity for improving education. It must be obvious that they could not deal with the matter in this small way. They must deal with it on a general basis, not in regard to this £110,000, but in regard to the £3,500,000 spent by the ratepayers under the system of national education.

MR. J. G. TALBOT (Oxford University) said he thought hon. Gentlemen opposite had failed to appreciate the point of the new clause. The object of the Bill, he understood, was to redress some inequalities which were supposed to exist between the Voluntary Schools which had been assisted and certain Board Schools. But, if in doing that they undid the work they had already done, they would stultify the work of Parliament. The intolerable strain from which the Voluntary Schools had sought relief arose in great measure from the fact that the School Board expenditure in many districts was so high that the Voluntary Schools had to raise large sums from voluntary sources to meet the competition. Parliament had relieved that strain, but if they raised the School Board expenditure again in districts where they had just assisted the Voluntary Schools, they would be undoing with one hand what they had done with the other. This proposal had been described as an attempt to limit the rate of School Board expenditure. Nothing could be less consistent with the facts. A correspondent had called his attention to the case of Leeds. He should never have thought of calling Leeds School Board necessitous, but under this Bill it received £6,000, whereas the Voluntary Schools of Leeds only received £5,000. At the present moment the School Board of Leeds was favourable to Voluntary Schools, and no doubt, in the existing circumstances, the £6,000 would go in reduction of rates. But it was quite possible that at the election next November the tables would be turned, and the majority now on the side of the Voluntary Schools would become a majority on the other side. What was to prevent the new School Board from using this £6,000 in producing excessive competition with the Voluntary Schools of Leeds?

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield) observed that it was reported that the noble Lord the Member for Rochester had said at a recent public meeting that the Voluntary Schools Act had "smashed up" the Education Act of 1870; but apparently he now thought that the work of destruction was incomplete, and therefore he had proposed this clause. It was practically a reproduction of one of the worst provisions of the Bill of last year, and one which had largely helped to bring about its defeat. Let the Committee consider the irony of the situation. The Government had been appealed to for pecuniary aid by the supporters of Voluntary Schools, and had given them substantial relief; but they had originally no intention of doing anything for the Board Schools. They were, however, shamed by public opinion into the production of the wretchedly inadequate Bill now before the House. Thereupon the noble Lord sought to convert it into a disabling Measure—to turn what was meant to be an olive branch into a rod for chastising luxurious School Boards. Why was it wished to intervene between the School Boards and the ratepayers? The noble Lord had said that County and District Councils represented the ratepayers better than School Boards; but why? All three were equally elected by the ratepayers, and those who disapproved of the expenditure of School Boards could dismiss the members at the next election and put others in their place. The ratepayers might safely be entrusted with the duty of seeing that there was no unnecessary expenditure on education. They were indeed too prone to limit it, and that was the great weapon of the opponents of School Boards, who appealed to the niggardliness and small-mindedness of ratepayers to prevent their coming into existence. He thought that that part of the noble Lord's speech which objected to the higher education of School Boards came with an ill grace from one who had had all the advantages of high culture, and yet seemed to grudge similar opportunities to the working classes. He (the speaker) regarded the clause as an anti-educational clause—a proposal which would stereotype education and stunt the growth of our educational system, and as such he hoped it would be decisively rejected. He was amused with the fact that both the noble Lord and the hon. Member for the Tunbridge Division had kept back till the end of their speeches what was probably the motive of their action—it was a dread of the competition between the Voluntary and the Board Schools. Their objections were, in fact, directed against the entire Bill. They wished the Voluntary Schools to have everything and the Board Schools nothing; but that was a policy which would have very little sympathy in that House, and still less in the country.

*SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) did not believe that this money would, as a rule, be extravagantly spent. He hoped it would go to improve education. He might remind the noble Lord the Member for Rochester that elementary science was the subject which children found to be most interesting. In one district where lectures on this subject were delivered, mothers found it necessary to change their washing-day so that it should not clash with the teaching, so great was the daughters' interest in it. The clause would deprive the ratepayers of that right of self-government which was so dear to the Anglo-Saxon race. He believed that the clause would either be inoperative or harmful, and he therefore hoped that it would not be pressed to a division.

*Mr. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): observed that the noble Lord the Member for Rochester wished the Committee to believe that much of this money would be spent in teaching girls specific subjects, including the properties of hydrogen and the gymnastics of the boiling point. But that would not be the case. Last year there were only 3,850 who were taught science at all; 23,000 were taught mechanics, and 162,000 were taught specific subjects. Only one child in 300 in public elementary schools received that kind of advanced instruction to which the noble Lord contended that this money would be wastefully applied. It might be found convenient in some Board Schools to add to a class of boys some few girls who wished to have the advantage of instruction in chemistry and mechanics, but as a rule the instruction given to girls under the head of extra subjects was instruction in domestic economy, physiology, hygiene, cookery, laundry, dairy, and needlework. Those were the subjects which were taught, and not the properties of hydrogen or the gymnastics of the boiling point. He was sure the noble Lord had no intention to mislead the Committee, and he hoped he would accept his correction. The interests of the Voluntary Schools had been cared for to some extent, and he would beg the noble Lord to allow the interests of the Board Schools to be cared for to some extent under this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"]

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he believed that in many respects the energy of the Board Schools as well as their money was frittered away on things which really had no educational value, but which happened to be the fancy of this or that educational expert. The peculiarity of a School Board was that it must be composed of educational experts, who only wished to spend as much money as possible on education, and could not look at the matter from an economical point of view. His right hon. Friend the Vice President complained that the Amendment would only give the Department control over a certain number of schools; but the case of his own Bill was that a certain number of School Boards were in a peculiar position. If so, it was quite fair to treat them in a peculiar way. ["Hear, hear!"] If his right hon. Friend objected to deal with certain schools in a peculiar way, why did he not include all Board Schools in this Bill? [*Opposition cheers.*] If this Bill had not been introduced for the relief of the rates, but for the general value of education, then his right hon. Friend ought to have included London, and Hull, and Manchester, as well as Leeds and Nottingham. ["Hear, hear!"] The only defence of the Bill was that relief was to be given to poor ratepayers. If so, was it not right to secure that the money voted for that purpose should go where it was intended to go? His right hon. Friend further said that the Department would be incapable of carrying out the work which the Amendment proposed to put upon it. "How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" [*Laughter.*] How have the Department changed! They had now become merely ignoramuses; they did not understand political economy, they did not understand the law of supply and demand, they could not contemplate the possibility of a successful argument with bodies less superior in knowledge and intention. [*Laughter.*] Surely, if the Education Department was equal to the elaborate control which was to be exercised over Voluntary Schools under the Act just passed, and the task of accurately forming a judgment on the question of what constituted a "necessitous" School Board—[*laughter*]—and he would like his right hon. Friend, by-the-bye, to explain how they were going to find out what constituted a "necessitous" School Board—[*Opposition cheers*]—they were capable of deciding what was a proper rate of expenditure. It appeared to him that the one was preliminary to the other. He was quite unable to understand why their intellects should have suddenly shrunk like a magic wallet—[*laughter*]—and why they should have become incapable of carrying out the functions assigned to them by the Amendment. He believed that in some of the large towns, particularly in Leeds, this Bill would make a very important difference to the value of the grant given under the Voluntary Schools Act, and would thus create great discontent among the supporters of Voluntary Schools. They would find, he believed, that the grant under the Voluntary Schools Act was too small, or in any case that it was an inadequate substitute for the rates, and, therefore, Board Schools would still have an immense advantage in the case of competition. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. STUART thought that everyone on his side of the House would have listened with great satisfaction to the speech which emanated from the Vice President. The right hon. Gentleman, in the course of his occupation of that office had made a number of very good speeches on education, and had produced some educational gems. The only thing he regretted was that the setting in which they were placed was sometimes so inadequate. It had been argued that this money was to go to the relief of the ratepayers, but he wished the House to observe that there was as much need of money for the improvement of education in the areas that would be benefited by the Bill as for the relief of the ratepayers. If it was laid down that this money was not to be spent in improving education, much of the benefit of the Bill would be taken away. If hon. Members on the other side of the House were so anxious to prevent Board Schools competing with Voluntary Schools, he was surprised that they did not side with the Opposition when the Voluntary Schools Act was before the House in trying to secure the maintenance of Voluntary subscriptions. ["Hear, hear!"] He maintained that education in all directions was always a necessity, and would always remain so, and the desire for increasing the excellence of education arose not from the requirements of the Department, but from the wish of the people of the country generally. ["Hear, hear!"] He believed there was a great deal of mistaken energy in education, but that was the result of the Code; but, if the House was desirous of making education what it ought to be, they would not do so by cutting off money that might be improperly spent, but by seeing that the money was spent properly. He believed the whole of this Debate might have been concluded by the speech of the Vice President, because it accurately gauged the situation, and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would be able to keep his Friends on the Front Bench up to the spirit of the speech he had delivered. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that he could not support the Amendment. The Bill had been introduced by the Government as an act of justice to the Board Schools, and he was sure that the Debates which took place on the last Bill as well as on this showed that the School Boards enjoyed a larger amount of confidence, even of affection, among Members on that side of the House than there had been reason to suppose. He greatly regretted that any proposal had been made from that side of the House to limit the generosity of the Government towards School Boards, or to minimise the expression of confidence in them. As to the administration of the grant, the Voluntary Schools Act was framed on the hypothesis that the Government was not able to administer each association of schools, and the Government had only to distribute the money in accordance with the recommendations of the associations. There was another argument worthy of consideration. Could the Government carry out the provisions of the Bill, supposing they had the administrative capacity? He believed that no Government, however anxious to do so, could perform such a task. It was beyond the power of any Government. No administration could be strong enough to say to a School Board representing a great constituency that their expenditure was excessive. The work would have to be accomplished through the inspectors, whose duty it was to keep up the standard of education. If this Bill passed the inspectors would say that the standard was too high, and the expenditure too great; and he did not think it was possible to obtain such services from the inspectors. Something had been said about Leeds; but why was the claim of Leeds so great? Because the children were so many. There were 42,872 children there, and, therefore, it was clear that the sum assigned must be large. The sum for West Ham was also large because the children there were numerous. There were, however, a comparatively small number of great towns which would have the benefit of the Bill. Personally he had some anxiety as to Lancashire, because it was there that the competition was strongly felt. In the county of Lancaster there were only four districts which obtained any advantage under the Bill; the total amount of aid given to the Lancashire School Boards was £291. He thought that a figure like that ought to console his friends in Lancashire. The majority of places deriving advantage under the Bill were small, and the sums were so insignificant that they could not disturb the balance of competition between the School Boards and the Voluntary Schools. He hoped that the Committee would accept the advice of his right hon. Friend, and would not accept the Amendment.

*Sir C. DILKE invited the noble Lord (Viscount Cranborne) to visit some of the schools in the poorer districts. The schools in the poorest districts were of different types, one represented by the schools in West Ham and in the neighbourhood of the Metropolis, and the other by the schools in Cornwall and the district which he represented. But those poor districts had one point in common. They were districts where generally the rate was so high that anything like extravagance was utterly out of the question. They were districts also which would educate children who worked elsewhere either at the time, or who would go elsewhere to work as soon as they were educated. The pressure of the rates in those districts was so extreme that there was no risk of extravagance at all; a rigid, parsimonious, penurious economy was much more to be feared. In the poorest districts, moreover, all the local authorities took the same view, and they would be equally fair about the relief to the rates. In the Forest of Dean School Boards the advantage would amount to 7d. in the rate, and this was a district where the ordinary rates were 8s. in the pound, and in the next half-year would be 9s. He believed it would be found that in West Ham also the representative authorities, however elected, all took the same view, and it was a delusion to believe in the existence of extravagance in those districts.

*Sir W. HART DYKE said that he was opposed to the proposed clause being added to the Bill. Although the Government had done much to reduce the inequality between the School Boards and the Voluntary Schools, it was yet suggested that they took back with one hand what they gave with the other. He did not think that his noble Friend ought to be afraid of this when they looked at the figures and compared the sum allocated in each case. If his noble Friend wished to apply his principle he must apply it to all the Board Schools of the country. That would be intelligible, but he pointed out that in this case the Bill would be a grievous educational failure in many of the poor districts of the country. One word as to the inequality under this Bill. No doubt it was true. The case of Leeds had been quoted over and over again, but he did not think it necessary to detain the Committee on that point.

*Mr. ERNEST GRAY said he should be sorry to allow this Amendment to pass without saying a word upon it. He admired the courage with which the Amendment was brought forward, but regretted that such an Amendment had been moved from those Benches. He condemned the Amendment, as not only unpracticable, but an unnecessary interference with the rights of the ratepayers. He thought the Amendment would give some colour to the allegations which were sometimes made against the Unionist Party to the effect that they were opposed to the progress of national education. The Amendment was in his view totally unnecessary, and would not accomplish the object which the noble Lord had in view. It was ridiculous to talk of extravagance in these heavily-rated districts, for the persons who would be returned to these School Boards would be those who gave an unlimited number of promises to keep down the rate. He feared if the Amendment were carried it would either be inoperative and useless or effective, and, therefore, objectionable. Whatever schools they were in, whether Board or Voluntary, they wanted the children educated. ["Hear, hear!"]

Viscount CRANBORNE said, before the Committee went to a division, he desired to say that he had no wish to bring any charge against poor Board Schools; but it did seem to him that, when those Boards came to ask for money, Parliament had a right to see how the money was spent. Let it be understood that everyone who voted against this Amendment set himself against any reduction which, he believed, the ratepayers were demanding on every hand. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He believed this Amendment was popular with the ratepayers.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a Second time."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 20; Noes, 294.—(Division List, No. 199.)

The announcement of the numbers was received with derisive Opposition cheers.

On the Question, "That this be the preamble,"

Mr. J. SAMUEL (Stockton) asked whether average attendance would be calculated in the same way as under the principal grant, or as under the fee grant?

Sir J. GORST said that, as he understood it, "average attendance" in all but one of the Education Acts meant average attendance according to the minutes of the Committee of Council in existence at the time. The single exception was the Fee Grant Act, where "average attendance" was calculated according to the rules existing when the Act was passed.

Mr. J. SAMUEL said that he had a letter from the Education Department in respect of a particular School Board, the terms of which were at variance with the right hon. Gentleman's statement.

Sir J. GORST said that he should have had notice of such a matter; but if a Question were put on the Paper, he would give an answer on which the hon. Member could rely.

Mr. ACLAND pointed out that, the grant under the Free Education Act being governed permanently by the Code for the year preceding the passage of that Act, great hardship was sometimes involved, both to Board Schools and Voluntary Schools. He would suggest a little Bill enabling the Department to alter the rules in regard to average attendance under the Free Education Act.

Sir J. GORST said that in the Bill of last year such an amendment was proposed, and might now have become law, had the Bill not been refused by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. [*Laughter.*]

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, with an Amendment; as amended, to be considered To-morrow, at Two of the clock, and to be printed.—[Bill 237.]

Viscount Cranborne.

Mr. ACLAND: Will the Bill be the first Order?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: Yes. I hope that will not be inconvenient.

WAYS AND MEANS (BUDGET RESOLUTIONS).

Considered in Committee.

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.) moved:—

TEA.

"That the Duty of Customs now payable on Tea shall continue to be charged, levied, and paid on and after the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, until the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the importation thereof into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say): Tea . . the pound . Four Pence."

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) proposed to leave out the words "Four Pence," and to insert instead thereof the words "Two Pence." He said the Chancellor of the Exchequer commenced his Budget statement the other day by a reference to the record of prosperity which he had to explain to the Committee last year. The revenue of the country, he said, speaking of 1895-96, had never been so large, the expenditure had been immense, and yet never before had so much been devoted to the reduction of the National Debt. Financially, the right hon. Gentleman said, we seemed then to be on the crest of the wave, and it would have been rash to anticipate that we should rise any higher; and yet, he added, we had done so. He told them that, in spite of political circumstances in the United States, which for a time had paralysed trade, in spite of distress in India, in spite of anxieties in the East of Europe, the revival of trade which had begun in the summer of 1895 had been maintained. The foreign trade of 1896 had exceeded that of 1895 by 5 per cent., and the increase in volume had been even greater than the increase in price. The home trade was not less flourishing; the diminished number of failures, the improved banking and railway returns, better employment in the skilled labour market, and, lastly but not least, a good wheat crop and better prices for it, all indicated the prosperity of the country. Surely such halcyon days as the right hon. Gentleman described furnished the occasion for some measure of relief to the taxpayer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer considered himself bound to be cautious in 1896, and he said he was bound to be cautious now. Of course, anyone in the position of a Chancellor of the Exchequer was bound to be cautious, not only this year and last year, but every year; but, he submitted, that caution was not altogether incompatible with occasional reductions of taxation. He also told them the other day that after this exercise of caution on his part the receipts from the income tax had largely increased, so that they had yielded more than they had ever yielded before, and had more than made up the remissions granted by his predecessor in 1894. Moreover, the Exchequer receipts from the Death Duties had very considerably exceeded his estimates, and the right hon. Gentleman very frankly admitted that he had underestimated the Death Duties. So, alike, from the living and the dead, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had gathered in more than ever he anticipated. But this year again he told them he had to be cautious, and why? Because, although tobacco exceeded his estimate, it only produced £265,000 more than in the year 1895-96; because, where in the case of wine he had looked for a reduction of receipts he had actually obtained £40,000 more than last year, and then, as he said, it was only £75,000 above his estimate; and, thirdly, because tea, which did not disappoint him by one single penny, only brought to the revenue £54,000 more than in the previous year, from all of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer deduced the conclusion that it looked as if the times were slackening, and as if in the matter of Customs revenue we had reached high-water mark. The conclusion appeared to him to be a little startling when they considered it side by side with the fact that in this very Budget the right hon. Gentleman had estimated for no less than £700,000 of income tax alone in excess of his previous estimate, and for £250,000 beyond his inflated receipts of last year. If a reduction of taxation was not to come now when we had reached a level higher than was ever anticipated, when we had reached high-water mark, when was it to come? Were we, in times of peace, to await the outbreak of war? were we in days of admitted prosperity to await the advent of evil days, before we began to look for a reduction of taxation? This, in his opinion, was a proper occasion for a reduction, and he should venture to propose a reduction, moderate in amount, calculated to afford relief to the greatest possible number of those most in need of relief, and a reduction which, while it applied to all divisions of the United Kingdom in common, might be expected to afford some larger relief to Ireland than to Great Britain, and he hoped to show some ground why an Irish Member might be excused if he regarded that as a not unimportant aspect of the question. The figures of the Chancellor of the Exchequer showed that a very much larger proportion of revenue was derived from indirect taxation than from direct taxation, the ratio being about 49¼ to 36. The burden of indirect taxation bore heavily upon the comparatively poorer classes, and therefore Ireland, by reason of the fact that she had a larger proportion of poorer classes than Great Britain, felt more keenly than Great Britain the inequity of the incidence as between direct and indirect taxation. He sought, therefore, a reduction of indirect taxation which should afford relief where it was most wanted, but should also go at least some little way towards redressing the inequity or incapacity to bear taxation and the actual burden of Great Britain and Ireland respectively. Naturally the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not allow the great opportunity which the Budget statement of this year afforded him to pass by without casting a glance over the last 60 years. The retrospect afforded him grounds to refer with pardonable pride to many subjects of congratulation. At the beginning of the period the export trade of the United Kingdom amounted to £42,000,000; it was now £240,000,000. The imports had risen meanwhile from £67,000,000 to £442,000,000. Where there were five depositors in the savings banks then there were now 43, and the population of the United Kingdom had increased enormously. The right hon. Gentleman was able to sing a kind of financial pæan upon the prospect between now and then. The felicitations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to that part of the United Kingdom called Great Britain were amply justified, but were they equally justified with regard to Ireland? Within the first decade of the 60 years the population of Ireland was some 8,300,000; for more than 50 years, without one single period of recovery or halt, the population had dwindled year by year until some four millions out of her former population of 8¼ millions had disappeared. Whilst they had been increasing in Great Britain the effectiveness of the wealth-producing classes, it was precisely those classes that Ireland had been losing. And yet what had they recently seen? The Government gathering in the repayments of the money grudgingly advanced for seed potatoes to the impoverished people of the West. In different parts of the country the very workhouses were being seized for debt, and the Board of Works, as mortgagees in possession, were foreclosing on the Lismore, Dungarvan and Waterford Railway. In 1837 Ireland contributed £4,496,000 to a total revenue of £50,000,000, or less than 9 per cent. Now, with all this extraordinary increase of population and wealth on the one hand, and of deterioration and exhaustion on the other, Ireland was pay-£50,000,000, or less than 9 per cent. to a total revenue now more than doubled. By reason of the financial treatment and the position forced upon Ireland by the Government and Legislature of this country, Ireland had been suffering from a sort of financial hæmorrhage which had always kept her poor. The Act of Union, apart from its provisions with regard to fiscal affairs, had most injurious results for Ireland in a totally different way. It was the first of a series of great measures of disestablishment, each and every one of which had wrought and was working results disastrous to Ireland. The first necessary and natural sequel of that Measure was the removal from Ireland of large numbers of her propertied classes, whose incomes had before then been spent and circulated in Ireland, to the maintenance and development of industries there. Ever since the Union the finances of Ireland had been administered from Westminster, and from the first days to the present decade they had been messed and muddled. Many persons required to be cautioned upon the readiness with which they received some official statements with reference to the accounts between the two countries. He gave two illustrations, one drawn from the first decade and the other from the present decade. In the year 1806 that House appointed a Committee to examine and report "on the joint charges of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland from the 1st January, 1801, to the 1st January, 1806, the proportions defrayed, and the balance remaining due from either party." The Committee reported, and they were unable to report the joint charge on Great Britain and Ireland, or to ascertain the relative situation of the two countries as to their expenditure, because the accounts furnished to them from Ireland, or on account of Ireland, they could not make head or tail of. They were faulty in construction and formation, and the Committee had to content itself with examining witnesses as to the keeping and auditing of the accounts for Ireland, and asking its Chairman to move for certain accounts during the following Session. The following Session never came. There was a Dissolution in October of that year, and he could not ascertain that the accounts in question were ever actually moved for. In the present decade there was a Home Rule Bill introduced at a time when Mr. Gladstone, the experienced financier, was the Prime Minister, and when the great Death Duties Chancellor of the Exchequer was in office. The Budget for Ireland framed in connection with the Bill only came to a few millions, and yet in one single item on one side of the account the Government was out no less than a sum exceeding a third of a million! Many English gentlemen seemed to think that poor Ireland had been somehow or other a continuous charge upon rich Great Britain. There was never, he thought, a more unfounded notion. In 1833 the first of the returns which really illustrated the situation well showed a balance of £11,389,179, which had been sent from Ireland to the English Exchequer, and how many tens of millions they had been drawing since he was not at the moment prepared to say; but it must very considerably exceed 100 millions sterling. The English Exchequer always had had a large balance of Irish money in their hands. All the money that had been spent in Ireland had been Irish money, and he defied anybody to prove that one single penny of English money had ever been spent in Ireland since the Union.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I must remind the hon. Member that the general financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland cannot be discussed on this Resolution. The only question now before the Committee is in regard to the imposition of the duty on tea.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said his notion was to lead up to the conclusion that in dealing with indirect taxation, including the duty on tea, the special circumstances of Ireland must needs be taken account of, and that it was impossible to appreciate the situation without having regard to that which had led up to them. However, he would content himself by drawing attention to the fact that from Ireland there had been continually flowing into this country a double stream—rental on the one hand and fiscal on the other. The second process of depletion from which Ireland was suffering at this moment, which reduced her tax-bearing capacity, and which had to be borne in mind when they were considering whether they would impose a duty of 4d. in the pound on the consumers of tea in Ireland, was the Disestablishment of the Church. The Established Church was endowed out of Irish property, and its income was spent in Ireland. They disestablished it and its officials, from sextons to archbishops, took their money, and in large numbers they removed from Ireland, generally to this country, leaving Ireland charged, as it was now, with the repayment of the amount to the National Debt Commissioners here. Now they had seen started a third of these processes of depletion in the disestablishment of the existing class of landlords. For the purpose of what was pleasantly called "settling the land question," they had devised a system of land purchase under which the former owner received the price of his property obtained by loan from the National Debt Commissioners. He had now lost his *status* as landlord, and in a large number of cases he went away, taking his money with him. But his former property, now in the hands of his old tenants, remained a charge for the repayment of the capital money so advanced. That charge constituted a further drain upon the resources of Ireland which would run for the next 49 or 50 years. He thought he had said enough to show that in any suggested modification, however slight, of the existing system of taxation, its effect upon Ireland was a matter deserving of the first consideration. He came next to the question of the principle upon which, and the mode in which, relief should be given. In reference to this point, he had read very carefully the speeches and writings of several English Members of that House, and especially of the hon. Member for Bodmin. The hon. Member told his constituents at Liskeard that the true principle of taxation was the principle of equal sacrifice—a principle which required that the richer a man was the bigger should be his proportionate payment. This was a true and a good principle if they started fair, if their initial situation was just all round, but in the present case the condition precedent necessary for the fair application of such a principle did not exist. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bodmin did not answer his own question, "Is proportionate payment obtained now?" for he went on to say:—

> "If so, then there is no injustice, because the poor man, be he English, Irish, or Scotch, pays out of his poverty, and the rich man out of his riches."

The right hon. Gentleman said "if." The French had a saying that "With an 'if' you could put Paris in a bottle." But in truth and in fact the rich man did not pay according to his riches, while the poor man out of his poverty paid a most disproportionate amount to the revenue; and as the people of Ireland were, taken all round, poorer than the people of England, they naturally felt the pressure more. The right hon. Gentleman proceeded to argue that if Irishmen were overtaxed, that circumstance was due to their larger consumption of whisky. But this was not a question between Irishmen, Scotchmen and Englishmen who drank spirits. No one suggested that the Irishman who drank whisky in Ireland should be treated differently from the Irishman who drank whisky in England; or, indeed, that there should be any reduction in the spirit duty at all. But the principle of taxing intoxicating liquors was not equally applied. He could not understand why so many Members were so solicitous about the sobriety of whisky drinkers, or why they conceived that Irishmen or Scotchmen were more amenable to fiscal repressive measures in the interests of sobriety when they did not extend the same measures to Englishmen. There were hundreds of thousands, and even millions of people in this country, who consumed intoxicating drinks in the form of beer at one-sixth of the duty which was collected from those who took alcohol in the shape of spirits. But this was not a question of alcohol only. When it was shown that in the matter of alcohol there was differential treatment according to the mode of consumption, only part of the case was stated. Was tobacco taxed in order to reduce consumption, or to promote a right way of living? Was it deemed to be in the fitness of things that smokers should be taxed in order that non-smokers might be benefited? What was to be said about tea, of which the people in Ireland consumed more per head, though they consumed less alcohol per head, than the people of Great Britain? He asked whether anybody maintained that the hard-working washerwoman was fairly taxed by means of tea according to her resources when compared with the rich man or the poor man, who did not drink tea, and possibly regarded it as something fit for Orientals and old women? Again, were coffee and chicory and dried fruits taxed with the object of either promoting a right way of living or diminished consumption? No; one and all of these taxes were open to a common objection.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to take a general survey of the taxation of this country on the Resolution before the Committee. That Resolution relates only to the tea

duty, and the hon. Gentleman must confine himself to that question.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said he understood it had been the custom that a general discussion on taxation should take place on the first question put from the Chair.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: No; the general custom which has been followed this year is that the general discussion is taken until a Resolution is passed. The first Resolution, the income tax Resolution, has been passed by the House.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said he would observe the ruling of the Chair. Tea was the luxury of the poor, and it was not the luxury of the poor, but the luxuries of the rich that should be taxed. It would be less unjust to increase the taxation on man-servants than it would be to maintain the present tea duty. He thought he had already shown that any reduction in taxation that could be made should take place in the indirect rather than in the direct taxation division of the revenue. There was some ground for relieving the numerous consumers throughout the country who at present contributed beyond their means as compared with the more affluent members of the community, and he had good reason for urging that any alteration in the duty should be such as would afford equal relief to Ireland to that which was afforded to Great Britain, and even more. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer might say that if a man proposed a reduction of taxation, he must be prepared to show that there is room for the reduction. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that last year he had calculated a balance for contingencies of a little over £100,000, with the result that he had a balance considerably exceeding two millions. This year the right hon. Gentleman estimated for a balance for contingencies of £500,000. There was no reason whatever to suppose that the present year would be less prosperous than the past. Very opportunely there had been issued a small Parliamentary Paper giving the figures of the trade and navigation of the United Kingdom during the first four months of the current year. What had been the Treasury experience of the prospects of this year? He found that on coffee, currants, raisins, tea, spirits, wine, and tobacco, there was a substantial increase—not of five per cent. as last year showed upon the previous year—but of something nearer eight per cent. There was abundant reason, therefore, for concluding that the balance for contingencies of half-a-million, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer anticipated on his present Budget, would considerably exceed two and a-half millions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would assuredly obtain a sum of more than two millions in excess of his balance for contingencies, and, therefore, he was well able to reduce the tax on tea by one-half.

On the return of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, after the usual interval,

MR. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) observed that the hon. Member for East Donegal, in moving to reduce the duty on tea from fourpence to twopence per pound, had raised the great question of the relative incidence of direct and indirect taxation. This was a subject in which he had himself, for a long time, taken great interest, and in 1889 he ventured to bring the matter before the House. He then argued that, owing to the system of direct and indirect taxation, the poor man paid more out of his one pound than did the rich man out of his many pounds. Since then, however, it was only right to say that a good deal had been done in the direction of reducing indirect taxation, so that it should fall less upon the poor. The question was whether they had gone far enough in this direction? He said that the inequalities of taxation still existed, and that, to a certain extent, the poor man still paid more out his small income, relatively per pound, than the rich man. But when they came to consider how the taxation was to be adjusted and put right they encountered many difficulties, and he thought he should be able to show that, by the Amendment before the Committee, the anomalies that would be produced would be as great as those which existed now. It was impossible by any system of indirect taxation to get a theoretical and absolutely accurate arrangement by which the incidence of taxation was proportioned exactly to the income of each individual. Take the question of tea. Say there was a teetotal and poor family of five persons, who used half-a-pound a tea per week. Under the present rate that family paid 2d. per week to the revenue, or 1s. 8d. per year each person to the State. If the family were to pay anything at all, was it an unreasonable thing that they should pay 1s. 8d. each for the security, peace, and protection of the State, and all the advantages of belonging to a highly-civilised State? As long as they maintained a system of indirect taxation, which included alcohol and various adjustments in tea and tobacco, they could not do away with the anomalies which must exist under that system. No one would suggest that, for the sake of an absolutely theoretically perfect system of taxation, the duty on alcohol should be taken off, because the evil which would ensue from that would be greater than the evil which now existed. Supposing they could get over all the anomalies by doing away with indirect taxation, which produced something like £47,000,000 of their revenue, and could raise the whole by some more direct system, let them consider how the balance sheet would possibly be made out. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment suggested that other subjects should be taxed, instancing the two of man servants and persons who had large gardens. But, from many practical standpoints, such a proposition was, on the face of it, quite impossible. If only half a farthing per head per day was paid on an article consumed by the mass of the people, it would produce a revenue of £7,000,000 per annum. To place an exorbitant tax on men servants would have the effect of rendering the man servant a thing of the past; and the result of taxing large gardens would be that they would be broken up and built upon, creating greater evils to the community than that which they sought to cure. If they did away with indirect taxation, the only possible sources of income were the death duties or the income tax. Obviously they could not take a large sum from both these subjects, because if they enormously increased the death duties they would reduce the amount payable as income tax; and if they enormously increased the income tax, they must ultimately reduce the death duties. The whole corpus of the death duties was roughly about 165 millions a year, and it would take 30 per cent. of that amount to raise the sum now raised by indirect taxation. If they excluded the smaller estates, it would take 30 per cent. on all estates between £10,000 and £100,000; 50 per cent. between £100,000 and £1,000,000; and the whole of those over £1,000,000 to raise the amount now raised in a simple and easy way by the present system of indirect taxation. As regards the income tax, it would require to produce the amount now raised by indirect taxation a 3s. tax on incomes between £1,000 and £2,000; 4s. on incomes between £2,000 and £5,000; 6s. between £5,000 and £10,000, and 10s. over £10,000. There was a common idea that it was easy to raise an unlimited amount upon income tax and death duties, but if they attempted to enormously increase these sources of revenue, they would kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. It was impossible to adjust with strict theoretic accuracy the individual burden of taxation upon rich and poor so long as the indirect taxation on alcohol was maintained. The only plan of relieving the burden on the poorer classes was by making up to them in other ways. Education in all its branches had become an enormous means of readjusting taxation between rich and poor. The expenses of sanitation and the facilities for obtaining better dwellings were advantages enjoyed directly by the poor, and only indirectly by the rich. It was by these means, rather than through any attempt to make the system theoretically accurate, by removing indirect taxation, that justice would be done and benefit conferred all round.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) agreed that it was desirable to continue the taxation on alcohol, and said so long as that was done there must be some anomalies in our system of taxation. But the present seemed to him an opportune moment to relieve the taxation on the necessaries of life. [*Cheers.*] The present Amendment only proposed to reduce the tea duty from 4d. to 2d. He would like to see it abolished altogether. During the past two years, owing to the increase of the revenue, the incidence of taxation had rather proved that the indirect had increased at the expense of the direct taxation. Therefore, there had been really a reversal of the policy of successive Governments in the past. Another reason for the abolition of the tea duty was that the cost of collecting indirect taxation was greater than in the case of direct taxation. Some reference had been made to the substituting of other subjects of taxation. He believed there was no necessity for the Government relieving the landlords last year, or giving money to the Voluntary Schools this year in the way they had done. But apart from that, there were subjects which might receive the favourable consideration of the Government. Mining royalties and ground rents might very well be taxed, and would yield an enormous revenue. Then the Government might consider the question of how far it was practicable to prevent the evasions of the death duties which at the present time was going on in this country. It was well known that many rich men were making in their own lifetime bequests to their heirs, simply with a view to evading the death duties. It was most desirable that the Government should prevent the evasion of what was a proper contribution to the Imperial Exchequer. With regard to the tea duty, it had in recent times been levied not so much on China as on Indian tea. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that 87 per cent. of the tea imported came from India. That being so they ought to urge the undesirability of taxing for the benefit of our own revenue an article produced by our fellow-subjects in India. A year or two ago we declined to allow the Indian Government to raise a revenue on cotton goods manufactured in this country, and equally we ought to hesitate before we taxed tea produced by our Indian fellow-subjects, especially at a time when India was passing through a very severe famine. The tax was oppressive on the poor of this country. The duty was not an *ad valorem* duty, the more expensive teas paying just as much as the cheaper qualities.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER observed that, as he had shown last year, the great bulk of the tea was of medium value. Only a very small proportion was of first-class value, and there was no doubt that poor people were more disposed to buy the dearer tea than the cheaper.

MR. J. A. PEASE urged that it was desirable to get rid of taxes upon the necessaries of life, and said that he should certainly vote for the Amendment.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) asserted that in proportion to the population more tea was consumed in Ireland than in England. It was remarkable how the use of tea had grown. In 1845 the consumption in the United Kingdom was only 85,000,000lb.; in 1895 it had gone up to 240,000,000lb. Ireland's consumption was 25,000,000lb., and the Exchequer was taking from Ireland at least £500,000 in duty, and he calculated that out of this sum £300,000 came out of the pockets of the poor. He trusted that the demand made by the Irish representatives would not be met by the usual reply, *non possumus.* The comments made last week by the organs of the Press—including the highest, *The Times* itself—ought to have convinced the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it was not a wise policy always to refuse the demands of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman could well afford to grant this concession, as the estimated revenue for the current year would yield an ample margin. Tea was absolutely free from duty in some of the colonies. [MR. BARTLEY: "What is the retail price in those colonies?"] He did not admit that that affected the argument. Then in Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, and Newfoundland the tax on tea was only 3d. Surely the wealthy mother country could afford to follow the example of her colonies in this matter.

MR. HUDSON KEARLEY (Devonport) said that the hon. Member for East Donegal, who moved the Amendment, approached the question from the Irish standpoint, namely, that all taxes at the present juncture should be resisted, because Ireland was bearing an unfair share of the burden. With that view he, of course, sympathised, but the reason why he intervened in the debate was that he held a strong opinion that the tea duty ought to be totally abolished. He had had some considerable experience in the matter, and he knew that, every time the duty was reduced, an extraordinary amount of annoyance, trouble, and expense was entailed on those interested in the business; and, although he had pledged himself over and again to what was called the free breakfast table, he would sooner that the duty should remain at 4d. than it should be reduced. Still he would not pledge himself not to vote for the reduction, because from one point of view reduction was better than nothing at all, as it would confer a benefit on the consumer; but the reduction of the duty to 2d. would be of no advantage to the duty payer. He would still be a duty payer, whereas if the duty were abolished, he would get rid of all that trouble. But this Amendment gave him an opportunity of putting another point to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that was as to the justification of charging those who paid the duty ¼ per cent. in addition. That was an exaction which could not be justified, and it was only fair that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should give the duty payer a quittance of it. They were told that it was charged in order to defray the expenses of collection; but surely, with an imposition of as much as 4d. a lb., this additional charge should not be made. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to concede the 2d. a lb. asked for he would beg and implore him to get rid of the duty altogether.

MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that he would also be glad to see the tax on tea abolished, but its reduction by twopence per pound would at least be a good beginning. It seemed to him that one aspect of the question had not been sufficiently emphasised by previous speakers, and that was the question of economy. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to take off a tax which would make a hole in the revenue to the extent of £2,000,000 he must, of course, make it up by putting on another tax, or by curtailing expenditure. Never before in the history of the country had so favourable an opportunity presented itself to a Chancellor of the Exchequer to lighten the burden of taxation as during this tide of prosperity in the past two years. The Exchequer had been overflowing with receipts, and the surpluses had been large and unexpected. Those surpluses would have enabled the right hon. Gentleman not only to waste money on the Army and the Navy, which appeared to be a mania at the present day, but also to take off taxes. The reduction in the tea duty would reduce the revenue by about two millions. But in the present year there had been a million squandered in a grant to Egypt, and now there was to be a squandering of £200,000 in fresh armaments for South Africa, an expenditure which would probably lead to the waste of many millions. There was a special reason why the Irish Members desired this reduction of the tea duty. The tax on tea took from the people of Ireland, because they were poor, about three times what would be a fair proportion for Ireland to pay on this or any other tax. In 1895 the tax on tea realised from England £2,850,000; from Ireland £524,000, and from Scotland £370,000. Thus Ireland paid about one-sixth of the amount paid by Great Britain in the tax on tea. According to the Report of the Financial Commission the highest proportion Ireland ought to pay in taxes was 1-20th, as compared with Great Britain. Ireland paid £363,000 more than her fair proportion at the lowest point fixed by the Financial Commission. If the tax on tea was repealed, and the deficiency made up by, say, an addition to the income tax, or the tax on ground rents, the injustice of the present financial system as it affected Ireland would be lessened to the extent of £363,000. This was a strong ground for causing the Irish Members to feel strongly on this matter. When they raised the question of taxes on drink, they were always met by the sneer that the Irish should drink less whisky; if they would drink less whisky they would pay less taxes. Well, that taunt would not apply on this occasion. Temperance advocates were all in favour of the consumption of tea. The poorer Irish people were all great tea drinkers. It was a remarkable thing to go into a country cottage and find better tea served up than they could get in a London hotel. He thought it showed the good taste of the Irish people. They could find no argument, no sneer, to use against the people because they were fond of tea, and they had no right to penalise the tea drinkers. The revision of this tax would be an act of justice not only to Ireland, but all over the country.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have no intention of going into the general question of direct as against indirect taxation. There are some hon. Members of this House who would desire to see no indirect taxation at all. I gather that that is the view of the hon. Member opposite, but it is not my view. I think we have been wise in reducing the proportion which indirect taxation bears to the whole of our revenue, and perhaps the process will be extended; but at the present moment I do not think that it would be wise to extend it. I do not think that it would be wise that, in place of the duty on tea, we should now put another penny on the income tax. I do not gather that anyone except the hon. Member opposite has suggested this, and, therefore, I do not think it necessary to trouble the Committee with an argument on such a proposal. But I should like to say a few words as to the amount of the burthen which the duty on tea inflicts on the poorer classes. The hon. Member for Devonport gave us an interesting speech, but I felt that his natural prejudices were struggling with his sense of public duty. [*Laughter.*] He said that he should prefer that the tea duty should be abolished, and objected to its being reduced. In that he was pleading for his own trade and not for the public advantage. ["Oh!" *and laughter.*] I think, on public grounds, the abolition of this duty would be a very doubtful policy. It must be remembered that the tea duty is the only way by which we make large numbers of the population contribute in any way to the Revenue, and I do not think that its remission would tend to that economy which the hon. Member for Mayo advocated in the speech he has just delivered. But does this tea duty press unduly on the people? There is no doubt that the price of tea has very largely diminished in recent years. I have figures here which show that, as compared with 20 years ago, the price of tea has largely decreased. I am speaking of the wholesale price rather than of the retail price; for there is no article which pays the country grocer so well as tea. It is an article out of which he makes his profits as largely and as certainly as the innkeeper makes his profits out of alcohol. That fact diminishes the comparative incidence of the tax upon the consumer, because the consumer, if he be a poor man in a country village, will probably pay something like 2s. per pound for the small quantities he buys; and therefore the duty is one thing to the wholesale dealer, but in proportion to the cost of the article a very much less thing to the consumer if he be a poor man. I have compared the decrease in the price of tea and sugar, and although undoubtedly there has been a greater decrease in the price of sugar since 1875, the duty having been abolished the year before, yet tea runs it hard. Then, has the duty stopped consumption? In 1875-76 the consumption of tea was 4·51 lb. per head of the population; in 1895-6 it was 5·77 lb., so that I do not think it can be said that the duty on tea has injuriously affected the price to the consumer, or has decreased the consumption. But I admit that it would give me great pleasure to reduce the duty on tea; and that for the reason which has been urged by hon. Members from Ireland—that tea is largely consumed in that country. But what am I asked to do? I am asked to deprive myself of half the duty on tea, amounting to nearly £1,900,000, in order to benefit Ireland to the extent of something like £250,000 or £260,000. That is rather like killing a sheep in order to get a mutton chop. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: The right hon. Gentleman is scarcely doing me justice. I declined to move anything which would not affect the poorer taxpayers in all parts of the kingdom.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Perfectly. I do not deny that, but he will not deny that three-fourths of his speech were concerned with the grievances of Ireland in the matter of taxation; he put it mainly as an Irish case. The fact is that if, when this matter has been fully inquired into, it is necessary to do something which will re-establish an equilibrium between Great Britain and Ireland in the sense hon. Members from Ireland desire, a very much larger adjustment of taxation in one way or another, either by some great change in our system of taxation, or by large grants for local purposes in Ireland, will be required than could possibly be effected by the change now proposed. I come to my real objection to the Motion. I cannot spare the money. [*Cheers.*] I have placed before the Committee the expenditure for which I have to provide. Parliament has sanctioned the expenditure. The House must provide for it. Parliament, I think, will sanction the expenditure upon the Navy which the hon. Member for East Mayo talks of as money squandered. Parliament, I think, will sanction the expenditure in strengthening the garrison in South Africa—["hear, hear!"]—which to my mind is a pledge for peace. [*Cheers.*] And Parliament, I think, will sanction the other demands which we have made upon the taxpayers, and which we believe are necessary for the advantage of the country. If the money is not to be found by the tea duty, where is it to come from? As has already been pointed out, to suggest that nearly two millions a year could be found by an additional duty upon man-servants or large gardens is simply absurd. Those are the two suggestions of the hon. Member for Donegal.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: No, Sir. I suggested that, without any addition whatever to taxation, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has an assured surplus which would still enable him to remit the tea duty.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am discussing the matter on the supposition that my Estimates of Revenue are accurate. I have given those Estimates to the best of my ability, on the best possible advice, and it is impossible for me to present to the Committee anything more than that which I believe is likely to be realised. And when the hon. Member for Donegal quotes the Returns for April of our imports as a sufficient reason for saying that there will be a larger revenue from Customs and Excise in the year than I have ventured to anticipate, I can only say, with all deference to him—for I know the study which he gives to these subjects—that his statement shows he has not mastered the details of the matter at all. These Returns relate to only one month, to begin with. They relate, too, to all kinds of imports besides those which pay duty. I can assure the hon. Member that the duty paid on tea in April is less than the duty paid in the corresponding month of last year.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: If the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to look at the figures he will see that they relate to the four months from January to April.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: But three of the four months have nothing to do with the matter. I am concerned with the year from the 31st of March onward, and it does not follow that, because the last quarter of the last financial year has been a profitable one, the coming year should be more prosperous. I have provided in my Estimates for a reasonable increase both of the Customs and Excise. I have very carefully gone into the details of that increase, and I should not have been justified in giving any higher figures. The only other suggestion that has been made, so far as I know, is that made by the hon. Member for Northumberland—namely, that I should in some way or other stop what he characterised as an evasion of the Death Duties. I take it he means that people are making gifts in their lives instead of leaving their property to their heirs. In my opinion that is a very proper practice—["hear, hear!"]—and certainly, as long as I am Chancellor of the Exchequer, I will do nothing that would be so tyrannical and so unjust as to interfere with the liberty of a healthy man to dispose of his property to whomsoever he will. [*Cheers.*] I have no suggestion before me which would in any way compensate for the source of revenue with which I am asked to dispense, being, as I have said, nearly £2,000,000 a year. Whatever the future may have in store, I can only say that for the present it is impossible for me to accede to the Motion that has been made, and, although hon. Members opposite may not approve of the expenditure which we have incurred, and therefore may not feel themselves bound to provide the resources to meet it, I think I may fairly appeal to the majority of the Committee, who do approve of that expenditure and who are, therefore, bound to provide the revenue to meet it, to support me in the course I have taken. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had received the proposal in such a very amiable way that they might hope that, if the chances of fortune were with him and trade improved, he might be able to meet their views on a future occasion. He did not intend to go at length into the question of the merits of direct and indirect taxation, but he desired to say that he did not wish to see all indirect taxation abolished. He did not believe that any Member of the House desired that indirect taxation on intoxicating liquor, for instance, should be abolished or reduced, and he thought that while many Members might think that the duty on tobacco might with advantage be altered, no one desired that a less duty should be levied. But it was indirect taxation on articles of household consumption to which they attached considerable importance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said he did not see his way to reduce the duty on tea, though it was quite evident that during the present year the proposed remission would not amount to a loss to the revenue of more than a million and a-half sterling. The supporters of the present Motion felt that, as the right hon. Gentleman had now been in office two years and had had surpluses of £7,000,000 in the aggregate, it was his duty not to bungle away the money as he had done—["Oh, oh!"]—either in expenditure or in giving grants and doles to different interests, classes, and localities, but to reduce the tea duties, which would have done far more to conduce to the personal comfort and convenience of the masses of the people. He was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted two things, which were very strong arguments in favour of the present proposal. The right hon. Gentleman said that the actual pressure on the consumers of tea at the present moment was not so great as it was some 10, 15 or 20 years ago, because the price of tea had considerably fallen; but, as his hon. Friend pointed out, the fact that the price had fallen had increased the weight of the tax.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Not on the consumer.

Mr. BUXTON did not say on the consumer; but, after all, it came to the same thing. ["Oh!"] The Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that the consumption of tea had very largely and quickly increased since the last reduction in the duty; and that was one of the strongest arguments in favour of a further reduction. Another reason for urgency was that, while 20 years ago, the proportions of Chinese and

Colonial tea consumed in this country were 84 and 16 per cent. respectively, they were last year 16 and 84 per cent. respectively. That was a most satisfactory fact from the Imperial and commercial point of view. ["Hear, hear!"] The argument that the abolition of the Tea Duty would give a certain part of the population immunity from taxation was only true in one sense. Employment, rent, and wages were all affected by the fact that so many millions had to be raised from the community in taxation. Besides, the amount raised from the Tea duty was comparatively so small—amounting to about 2s. a year on the individual—that its abolition was hardly to be considered from that point of view. It might be said that we ought not to tamper with the basis of taxation; but with its enormous reserves this country would never depend nowadays on the Tea Duty in time of war. He hoped, from the tone of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that next year or the year after he would see his way to continue this beneficent policy of reducing the indirect taxation. ["Hear, hear!"]

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said that he had advocated the reduction or abolition of the Tea Duty in the House and in the country, and he felt bound to support the Amendment. He was sure that any reduction in the Tea Duty would be very well received. As to recouping the loss to the Exchequer which would follow from the abolition of the Tea Duty, he had no sympathy with the proposal to increase the tax on manservants; for that would make employment harder to get, though, if the suggestion had been for a tax on the employment of foreigners and German waiters, there might have been something in it. Neither could he sympathise with the suggestion for an increased Income Tax, which was far higher now than it ought to be in time of peace. There was much in what had been said by the hon. Member for Poplar as to the increased consumption of colonial tea. When they found that the course of trade was tending so much in favour of articles produced in the British Empire as the tea trade was at the present time, they had this additional reason for the Chancellor of the Exchequer taking this matter into his most serious consideration. He had another reason for urging the reduction or the abolition of the duty, and that was that it was paid entirely by the consumer in this country, and did not in any degree benefit any producer in this country. If this tax were transferred from tea to articles which competed with British trade he thought it would be infinitely better for the whole of the community. Two per cent. on the importation of foreign manufactured goods would find the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the £2,000,000 he would require if this Resolution were accepted by the Committee. It might not be possible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do so in the present year, but he did venture to assure him that what many supporters of the Unionist Party desired was a transference of this indirect taxation to taxes which would benefit the trade and labour of this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would readily find a new source of revenue in the large and increasing importation of goods which competed with the trade and labour of this country, and he hoped that his right hon. Friend would at some future time be able to reduce, if not to abolish this duty upon an article produced largely within the British Empire, and one which was paid entirely by the consumer.

MR. J. W. LOGAN (Leicester, Harborough) said he heartily supported the Amendment, and regretted that it had not received warmer and more strenuous support from the Front Opposition Bench. The Chancellor of the Exchequer suggested that, if the duty were removed, it would have the effect of taking off the shoulders of large portions of the community the only remaining contribution which they made towards the maintenance of the country. Who were those people? The very poorest of the poor—the people who could afford to drink nothing but tea. This duty was a heavy tax on the poorest people of the country. He could not for the life of him understand how well-to-do people could be comfortable while they knew that large portions of the population of this country had to pay what was a heavy impost upon their slender means. In a rich country like England they ought to take off the shoulders of people this miserable tax of 4d. a pound upon tea. On the other side of the House there were many Members who had been sent to the House by the agricultural labourers, and he sometimes asked himself what the agricultural labourers were thinking of when they voted for those hon. Gentlemen. But on behalf of those poor men who, to the eternal disgrace of England, only receive 9s. or 10s. a week wages, he claimed support for the Motion from their representatives on the other side of the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had asked how the loss to the revenue was to be made up if the duty on tea were repealed. For his part he would a thousand times rather have a penny in the pound added to the income tax than that poor old women and agricultural labourers should be taxed to the extent of 4d. in the lb. on tea. The Government had done a great deal for the wealthy people of the country. They had given two millions a year to the rich landlords, and £600,000 a year to the parsons. Let the Chancellor of the Exchequer now commemorate the 60th year of the glorious reign of Her Majesty by knocking off the tax on tea.

MR. LOUGH hoped that hon. Members opposite who represented the masses of the people in large centres of population would join in the excellent example set by the hon. Member for the Central Division of Sheffield—[Sir HOWARD VINCENT: "Hear, hear!" (*Laughter.*)]—in saying that he would vote for the Motion. He thought the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was extremely interesting. It was probably the best speech in support of the Irish case that had been delivered in the course of the Debate. He hoped the Irish Members would take to heart the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that in order that Ireland might get £650,000 he was asked to give up two millions. The right hon. Gentleman had said in effect, "Don't be so solicitous about Great Britain; ask what you want for your own country." He would do it if his hon. Friends from Ireland did not, and he would move at a later stage that the tea tax should be taken off Ireland without being disturbed in Great Britain. The right hon. Gentleman said that no suggestion was made as to where the two millions might come from. Why should not a tax be put upon silk rather than on tea? In that way two millions might easily be obtained. There would be just as much free trade in the one tax as in the other. It was not true to say that if the tax on tea were taken off some people in this country would pay no tax at all. If the poor did not pay in tea they paid in depreciated wages and increase of rent. He pointed out that when a little tax of £50,000 was put on a trade, the trade was always glad to pay it; they were not taxing the trade, for they levied, not £50,000, but £200,000. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the proportion of the duty to the price of tea was less now than formerly. He was entirely wrong about that. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!"] He knew something about it. It was no disadvantage in that House for a man to talk of what he understood. Those Members very often talked the most who knew the least. [*Cheers.*] The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the average price of tea was 2s. per lb. Throughout the country it did not exceed 1s. 6d. or 1s. 4d., as the retail price to the consumer. So if the duty was 4d. in the lb., that was no less than 25 per cent. on the retail price. The Chancellor of the Exchequer created a great deal of discontent in the trade by his statement of the high price at which tea was sold. But if they left out the expensive qualities, the average price of tea sold in England was 6½d. or 7d. in the public sales, and on this a duty of 4d. in the lb. was levied. He supported the Motion of the hon. Member for East Donegal.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR contended that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had in no way answered the case he put forward. His contention was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could afford this remission of duty without disturbing any portion of his Budget. He said he had to meet certain expenditure which the House had sanctioned for the Navy, for war purposes, and other matters. But his own point was that, without disturbing any of this sanctioned expenditure, there were abundant funds at the disposal of the Treasury. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer reckoned for a balance of £433,000, and this year for a balance of £503,000. But instead of £433,000, he realised £2,442,000. There was every indication that this year they would have a repetition of the experience of last year, but on a larger scale. The right hon. Gentleman did not deal with this, nor did he explain why he anticipated that we had reached high-water mark. From the figures the right hon. Gentleman had given, he must anticipate that this year would be more prosperous than last year. If we were still on the rising tide, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had £2,442,000 where he expected £433,000, might it not be expected that he would receive £2,500,000 where he expected £503,000? He himself had taken the official figures from the 1st January, 1897, and had compared them with the figures of the first four months of 1896, and they showed conclusively that the progress and development and increased duty on articles was greater now than it was last year. The contention that he would have £2,500,000 surplus at the end of the financial year had not been touched by the right hon. Gentleman. If the unofficial Estimates proved to be true against the Treasury Estimates, would the Chancellor of the Exchequer next year, if he found he had £2,000,000 beyond what he estimated, agree to a reduction of 2d. in the lb. on the tea duty?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I can make no promise with regard to next year's Budget.

Question put, "That the words 'four pence' stand part of the Question."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 95.—(Division List, No. 200.)

Main Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

"That the Duty of Customs now payable on Tea shall continue to be charged, levied, and paid on and after the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, until the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the importation thereof into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say):—Tea the pound Four Pence."

Resolution to be reported To-morrow at Two of the clock; Committee report progress; to sit again upon Wednesday.

METROPOLITAN AND OTHER POLICE COURTS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [3rd May] further adjourned till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS (HOLIDAYS) BILL.

On the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill,

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked for some explanation of the Measure.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool) said that he had explained the purpose of the Bill on a former occasion. At present, when a Bank Holiday was ordered, as on the occasion of the approaching Jubilee, the Secretary of State for the Home Department had no power to close the police courts. He thought it would be admitted that they ought to be closed, and the power which the Bill would confer of doing so by order was desirable, in order that commercial inconvenience might be obviated in connection with Bills of Exchange falling due on the day.

MR. D. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) asked what was to become of prisoners locked up before a Bank Holiday. Were they not to get a holiday as well as the Magistrates? [*Laughter.*]

Read a Second Time, and committed for To-morrow, at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY [7TH MAY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,485, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,074, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."

Resolutions agreed to.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Committee (Progress, 10th May).

Clause 1,—

EXPLANATION OF 26 AND 27 N.C. C. 65, SS. 24, 27.

For removing doubts, it is hereby declared that the power under section twenty-four of the Volunteer Act 1863, to make rules with respect to a Volunteer Corps shall extend, and be deemed to have always extended, to rules for securing the efficiency of the members of the corps, and that a fine for the breach of any rule made under that power shall not be deemed to be a civil debt.

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) moved after the word "power" to insert the words "and approved by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department." He said that the Bill proposed to amend the Volunteers Act of 1863, under which the Courts had decided that if a Volunteer regiment made a rule and provided that for its violation a penalty should be incurred, that penalty was only a civil debt, which could not be enforced by imprisonment. The object of this Bill was to convert what at present was a matter of civil debt into a criminal offence, and the debt was in the last resort to be enforcible by imprisonment. The Act of 1863 provided by Section 24 that the rules which a corps made should be approved by the Secretary of State for War, but he held that the War Office was not the proper Department to have the power of revising and approving these rules. He was not speaking without book, because in the case of the Queen *v.* Lewis, decided by the Queen's Bench Division in May last year, the Court held that the rule which the Volunteer corps had made in that case was *ultra vires.* But the War Office had passed and approved the rule in that case, and, therefore, the check exercised by the War Office could not be regarded as any check at all. It was obvious that at the War Office they had not the machinery to check these rules, and, therefore, he proposed to substitute the Home Office for the War Office.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight) said that when the purport of these rules was understood by the House, he thought hon. Members would be of opinion that the War Office was the proper authority. He contended that the hon. Member was taking advantage of a technical point to discuss matters which were not germane to the present Bill. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. PICKERSGILL said the hon. and learned Gentleman had made no reply to his arguments. A few weeks ago the Lord Chief Justice held that the corps in the case to which he had referred actually made a rule which it had no power to make. He cited that case to show that the check of the War Office was no safeguard at all, as was shown by their having sanctioned that rule. He moved the Amendment simply in order that these rules might be checked in the way which he thought the Legislature intended when the principal Act was passed.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee to report progress; to sit again To-morrow, at Two of the clock.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LAW OF EVIDENCE (CRIMINAL CASES) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Committee deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Third Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.]

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

FOREIGN PRISON MADE GOODS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

MARRIED PERSONS' SMALL INDUSTRIAL INCOMES (TAX RELIEF) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 24th May.

HIGHWAYS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (SCOTLAND) LOANS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday.

SALE OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

CHAFF-CUTTING MACHINES ACCIDENTS BILL.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

TITHE REDEMPTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned till Thursday.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till Thursday.

CANALS PROTECTION (LONDON) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

On the Order for the Third Reading of this Bill,

Mr. CRILLY objected to the Bill being taken at that hour (Twelve o'clock).

Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) hoped that the hon. Member would not persist in his objection. There was no opposition to the Bill locally. It was of great importance locally, because the channel into the Mersey would be lighted by two different authorities unless the Bill became law.

Mr. CRILLY said he had received communications from Liverpool on the subject which induced him to oppose the Third Reading of the Measure.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

CANALS AND NAVIGABLE RIVERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MONEY LENDING.

The Select Committee on Monday Lending was nominated of—Mr. Ascroft, Mr. Thomas Bayley, Mr. Caldwell, Captain Chaloner, Mr. Garfit, Mr. Hazell, Mr. Jeffreys, Dr. McDonnell, Mr. Price, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Warr, Mr. George Whiteley, and Mr. Yerburgh.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

MOTION.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (LONDON).

Bill to make further provision with respect to the arrangement of Polling Districts in the Administrative County of London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bond, Mr. Harrison, and Colonel Hughes; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 238.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

In answer to Sir J. Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich),

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY said: The first business to-morrow will be the Report stage of the Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill; the second Order will be the Report of the Budget Resolution; and the third Order will be the Metropolitan Police Courts Bill.

Mr. EDWARD MORTON (Devonport) asked what Supply would be taken on Friday?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY said that Irish Supply would be taken, but as to the particular Votes he was largely in the hands of the Irish Members.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Galway, N.): Will the Irish Public Works be taken?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: No, Sir.

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 11th May 1897.

PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with Amendments: The Report thereof to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.—[No. 74.]

TRUSTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be Read 3ª on Thursday next.

QUARTER SESSIONS JURORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—

SPECIFICATION OF DIVISIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE ACT.

(1.) The Lord Lieutenant may, when it appears to him desirable for the relief of jurors from unnecessary attendance at Quarter Sessions, by Order in Council, declare the provisions of this Act to be in force in any specified Quarter Sessions division as from the date of the Order, and the provisions of this Act shall, after the said date, be in force in such division, and that division shall be a specified division within the meaning of this Act.

(2.) Any Order made under this section may be revoked by a subsequent Order made in the same manner.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2,—

PROVISION FOR LODGING NOTICE OF BILLS OF INDICTMENT AND CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Where it is intended to present a Bill of Indictment at a Court of Quarter Sessions in a specified division, or to proceed at such Court with the trial of any person on a Bill of Indictment previously found, the prescribed notice of such intention shall be lodged by or on behalf of the person having the conduct of the prosecution in the office of the Clerk of the Peace not later than three clear days (exclusive of a Sunday) previous to the day appointed for the trial of criminal causes before that Court.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3,—

JURORS TO BE RELIEVED FROM ATTENDANCE IN CERTAIN CASES.

(1.) Where in a specified division no such notice has been so lodged as aforesaid, the Clerk of the Peace shall forthwith report to the Sheriff to that effect, and the Sheriff shall thereupon notify in the prescribed manner all jurors summoned to attend the Court for the purpose of criminal business that their attendance will not be required.

(2.) Every person so summoned and subsequently notified under this section shall be given credit for an attendance as if he had attended in pursuance of the summons.

(3.) Where it is the duty of the Clerk of the Peace to summon jurors to attend at a Court of Quarter Sessions, the duties imposed by this section upon the Sheriff shall be discharged by the Clerk of the Peace, and it shall not be necessary to make a report to the Sheriff.

*LORD MORRIS said he had an Amendment to propose to the clause, with the object of providing for the expenses of the Sheriff in connection with the duties imposed upon him under the Bill. As the Bill stood, there was no provision; the matter was by the proposed Amendment left entirely in the discretion of the Grand Jury. It was necessary that some provision should be made in the Bill for the new duties cast upon the Sheriff. He moved accordingly, as a new Sub-section to Clause 3:—

(4.) The expenses of this Act, incurred in connection with the duties hereby imposed on Sheriffs and Clerks of the Peace, shall be defrayed out of the county cess, and it shall be lawful for the Grand Jury of every county, and for every Town Council empowered to make presentment, as the case may be, from time to time, at the next ensuing assizes or presenting term, and they are hereby required, without previous application at presentment sessions, or otherwise, to present all such sums of money as they may deem reasonable and necessary for defraying such expenses.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH said there was no objection to the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord except that it would be better, as a matter of drafting, that it should be moved as a new clause.

Amendment agreed to, and inserted as a new clause (Clause 4) after Clause 3.

*Lord MORRIS further moved, after the clause last inserted, to insert the following new clause:—

Clause 5,—

(5.) The Clerks of the Union shall, in compiling the lists of jurors each year for revision, set forth, as far as practicable, in a separate column on the said lists, after the name of each juror, the name of the post office nearest to his residence.

The noble Lord pointed out that the Sheriffs' list did not require that the post town of the juror should be given, and it was obvious that without such a provision as that embodied in this Amendment the letter might miscarry and not reach a juror at all, and it might be impossible for the Sheriff to carry out his duty completely.

The Earl of DENBIGH said the Amendment was somewhat out of order in connection with this particular Bill. It was really an Amendment to Section 9 of the Jurors (Ireland) Act, 1871, and, as such, it was outside the scope and not covered by the title of this Bill. It was the opinion of the Irish Office that it was not necessary to deal with the matter in a fresh Act of Parliament, but that it was competent to the Department to deal with it as an ordinary Instruction, if it were found necessary to do so, as a matter of general convenience to the Sheriffs of Ireland, and in consequence he regretted to say he could not accept the Amendment.

*Lord MORRIS asked leave to withdraw the Amendment, intimating that he should bring the subject up again when the Bill came before the Standing Committee.

Proposed new clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4,—

POWER TO ADJOURN TRIALS.

(1.) In the case of any person returned for trial, or whose trial has been adjourned to a Court of Quarter Sessions in a specified division where the jurors have been notified under this Act that their attendance will not be required, the Chairman or Recorder presiding over the Court shall adjourn the trial of such person to the next ensuing Court of Quarter Sessions for any division of the county in which the specified division is included, or to the next ensuing Court of Assize for such county, and any recognizance entered into in respect of such trial shall, without renewal, be valid and binding in respect of the adjourned trial.

(2.) Such Chairman or Recorder shall have, in addition to all powers already vested in him, power to admit such person to bail until the sitting of the Court to which his trial is adjourned.

The Earl of DENBIGH moved, in Sub-section (1), to leave out the word "shall"—["shall adjourn"]—and to insert the word "may." The object of the substitution was that the Chairman or recorder presiding over the Court might have full option of discharging the prisoner if there should be any sort of idea that there had been wilful delay for the purpose of annoying the individual in question.

Amendment agreed to; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5,—

RULES. 40 & 41 VICT. C. 56.

The power of making rules and orders conferred by section seventy-nine of the County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act 1877, shall be exercised for the purpose of carrying this Act into effect.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 6,—

DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

The expression "Clerk of the Peace" includes Clerk of the Crown and Peace where the offices have been united;

The expression "Sheriff" includes Under Sheriff; and

The expression "prescribed" means prescribed by rules and orders in pursuance of this Act.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 7,—

SHORT TITLE, AND EXTENT OF ACT.

This Act may be cited as the Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Act 1897, and shall extend to Ireland only.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.—[No. 75.]

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to Order); Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House Adjourned at a Quarter before Five o'Clock, to Thursday next, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 11th May 1897.

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Sir H. VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To call attention to certain matters relating to the trade of the United Kingdom and the Colonies; and to move a Resolution.—[*An early day.*]

RAILWAY RATES (IRELAND.)

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): To call attention to the excessive railway rates in Ireland; and to move a Resolution.—[*An early day.*]

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICES (LEWIS).

Mr. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the small number of money order offices in the Island of Lewis, the population of which numbers nearly 30,000, he will again consider the advisability of opening money order offices at Barvas and Crossbost without guarantee?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. R. W. Hanbury, Preston): The Postmaster General regrets that the circumstances of the case would not justify him in opening offices at the places in question without guarantee. There are already six in the so-called Island of Lewis, which is not an island, but only half a one.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that in reply to an inquiry for the names of the post offices in the Island of Lewis at which money order and savings bank business is transacted the Secretary on the 31st March issued the following list, viz. Callanish, Carloway, Harris, Miavaig, Ness, Obbe, Port of Ness, and Scalpay, whether he is aware that three of the eight places named are not situated in the island of Lewis at all, and that the list is otherwise inaccurate, the most important money order office in the island, viz. Stornoway, being omitted; and, whether, in the circumstances, he will now give an accurate list of the money order offices in the island?

Mr. HANBURY: It is regretted that in the letter mentioned by the hon. Member, the sub-post offices in both Harris and Lewis (which are divisions of the same island) were included instead of those in Lewis only. Stornoway was accidentally omitted and the list was in that respect inaccurate. The money order offices in Lewis are as follows:—Stornoway, Callanish, Carloway, Miaviag, Ness and Port of Ness.

UPPER DIVISION CLERKS (CHARITY COMMISSION).

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury (1) whether the clerks of the Upper Division in the Office of the Charity Commission are required by Treasury Minute of 27th May 1883 to be either barristers or solicitors; (2) whether such clerks are appointed by open competition and after examination by the Civil Service Commissioners, or are nominated personally by the head of the Department without such examination; and, (3) if by the latter method, whether there is any reason why these clerks should not be appointed by open competition, as in the case of clerks of a similar class, required to possess legal qualifications, in the Office of the Ecclesiastical Commission and the Office of Woods?

MR. HANBURY: The answer to the first paragraph is Yes. The limits of age are 25 to 32, and the scale of salary £250, rising to £400. These clerks are nominated by the Charity Commissioners without a Civil Service examination, but they must either be barristers of not less than two years' standing who have been called to the Bar after passing a public examination, or else persons who have been duly admitted as solicitors under the regulations of November 2, 1875. The present system secures men possessing the special qualifications necessary for the work, and there seems no need to alter it. I am not aware of any similar officers at the Ecclesiastical Commission. At the Office of Woods the limits of age and the scale of salary are much lower and they are not required to be either barristers or solicitors.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (EXAMINERS).

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury (1) whether appointment to the class of examiners in the Education Department is made by open competition and after examination of candidates by the Civil Service Commissioners, or by the personal nomination of the head of the Department without such examination; and if by the latter method, whether there is any reason why the system of open competition could not be adopted with regard to these appointments; and (2) whether the official duties of the Examiners are generally analogous to those of Clerks of the Upper Division in other offices, and such as could properly be performed br Clerks of the Upper Division?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Examiners in the Education Department are appointed by the Lord President of the Council. The special qualifications needed for the office could not, in the opinion of the Committee of Council, be secured by open competition. The answer to the last paragraph is in the negative.

Captain Norton.

LAND COMMISSION.

MR. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Sub-Commissioners who sat at Carrickmacross on 18th March last, to fix fair rents on the estates of Mr. S. E. Shirley and Major Tennison respectively, have not viewed all the farms yet and in no case has judgment been given; whether he can say what is the cause of the delay in viewing the farms of tenants whose cases were heard at Carrickmacross on 18th March; and, when will judgment be given?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am informed that the lay Assistant Commissioners have not yet completed the inspections in the cases recently heard at Carrickmacross, but that the work, which has been somewhat retarded by bad weather, is being proceeded with, with as much expedition as possible. The decisions will be announced as soon as all the inspections have been finished, but no date can yet be fixed.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that tenants on the estate of Mr. R. C. Leslie, Ballybay, who served notice before November last to have their fair rents fixed on their holdings, have not got their cases heard yet; whether he can state the cause of this delay; and, whether the Sub-Commissioners will sit at Ballybay to try the cases in question, and when?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In all cases on this estate where originating notices were received prior to the 1st November last the applications have been listed for hearing and appear upon a list, the hearing of which was commenced at Castleblayney on the 29th April. There has been no delay in dealing with these applications. It is probable that the Chairman of the Sub-Commission will sit at Ballybay for the disposal of the cases referred to, but the place of hearing has not been finally arranged.

EVICTION (LITTLEDALE ESTATE, COUNTY WICKLOW).

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutentant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Receiver on the Littledale Estate, county Wicklow, has refused from James Byrne an offer of 20 years' purchase for the farm from which he had been evicted; and, if so, whether the Receiver consulted Mr. Justice Ross before refusing the evicted tenant's offer?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: So far as can be ascertained there are not any proceedings pending in the Land Judge's Court in reference to the estate mentioned in this Question.

CONGO STATE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (1) whether the territory west of the 30th meridian E. of Greenwich leased by Her Majesty's late advisers to His Majesty Leopold II, Sovereign of the Congo State, continues to be so leased, or what is its international position, the corresponding lease by the Congo State to Great Britain named in Article III. of the Agreement having been cancelled by the withdrawal of Article III.; and (2) whether in the territory east of the 30th meridian E. of Greenwich leased at the same time by Her Majesty's Government to King Leopold, but not since renounced by the Congo State, the special flag named in the Agreement is used by the Congolese forces, and what is it?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The position created by the circumstances mentioned in the first paragraph of the right hon. Baronet's Question remains the same as it was under the late Government. The special flag to be used in the territory named in the second Article of the Agreement has not yet been defined.

EXPULSION OF MR. MACPHERSON FROM PARIS.

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has received official information that Mr. Macpherson, a British subject for many years resident in Paris, has been expelled from France by order of the Minister of the Interior; whether the Government have any information to show that the ground of the "arrêté d'expulsion" was that Mr. Macpherson had been active in arranging a conference in connection with the International Federation of Dock Labourers; and whether the Secretary of State proposes to make inquiry into the matter?

MR. CURZON: Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris has reported the expulsion of Mr. Macpherson on the ground that his presence on French territory was of a nature to compromise public safety. Her Majesty's Ambassador has been instructed that if the action of the French Government was considered to be required in the interests of public order, and if it has been confined strictly to what was necessary to enforce the expulsion, they appear to be within their rights and the occasion for diplomatic action does not arise.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state the hours of arrival and dispatch of the mid-day letters in Cavan and Belturbet respectively; whether he is aware that, whilst the acceleration of the mails all over Ireland has meant a gain of an hour and a half at least to most Irish towns, it only means about half an hour in county Cavan: and, whether, without incurring the cost of an extra train, the Postmaster General could press the Great Northern Railway Company to start their train at 8.30 a.m. instead of 9 a.m. as at present?

MR. HANBURY: At Cavan the hour of the arrival of the mail is 11.5 a.m. and of departure 1.45 p.m. At Belturbet they are 11.35 a.m. and 1.45 p.m. The gain of time for reply at Cavan is 40 minutes, and Belturbet ten minutes. Even if the railway company would agree to start the train from Dundalk at 8.30 a.m. instead of at 9.0 a.m. a further difficulty lies in the fact that the train from Dundalk joines at Clones a train from Belfast which only reaches Clones at 10.21 and which the Company cannot see their way to run earlier. Unless, therefore, an additional train were run beyond Clones, the train from Dundalk must still wait for the Belfast train, and thus no benefit to Cavan and Belturbet or to Enniskillen would arise from an earlier start from Dundalk.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman put a further question to the railway company as to the reason why in Cavan they have 40 minutes longer and in Belturbet only 10 minutes?

MR. HANBURY: It depends entirely upon the running of the trains of the Great Northern Railway. They refuse to alter their trains for mail purposes, and the number of letters and postal matters carried is not sufficient to justify additional trains for the purpose.

MR. DALY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the manager of the Great Northern Railway laid the blame at the door of the Treasury for not running additional trains.

[No answer was given.]

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY (TULLYVIN, CO. CAVAN).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that faults have been found by the County Inspector with the performance of his duties by Sergeant Kelly, of Tullyvin, County Cavan, and that this man has not got on well with the inhabitants of the district under his charge, this sergeant will be transferred to another station?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There is no foundation for the statements made in the Question. The County Inspector has not had occasion to find fault with Sergeant Kelly, who gives entire satisfaction in the performance of his duties. I have no reason to believe that he does not get on well with the people of the district. It is not proposed to transfer him to another station.

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he will inquire into the circumstances of the death at the battle of Tel-el-Kebir in 1882 of Trumpeter Fanning of the 18th Hussars, who was killed whilst engaged in saving his Commanding Officer under circumstances of great bravery; whether he is aware that the mother of this young man is residing at Longford in very distressed circumstances; and whether, having regard to the circumstances of the case, the War Office will make his mother a compassionate allowance?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Question of the hon. Member probably refers to Trumpeter Fanning, of the 19th Hussars, who died of wounds received in the battle of El Teb in 1884. The Secretary of State has no funds from which to make a compassionate allowance to the mother of a soldier; but if she can prove that she was in any considerable degree dependent on her son the case might be one for consideration by the Commissioners of the Royal Patriotic Fund.

ALDERSHOT CAMP SEWAGE FARM.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Aldershot Camp Sewage Farm, although much improved in its general condition, is still unsatisfactory as regards the character of the effluent; and whether it is the intention of the authorities to expend the extra money necessary to render the present farm successful, or whether it is intended to remove the operations to another site at a greater distance from the camp?

MR. BRODRICK: This subject, which is a very difficult one, and has been discussed with reference to the treatment of the sewage of the town as well as of the camp, is still under consideration, and there are some points which are not yet cleared up; but the Secretary of State hopes to arrive at a decision very shortly.

BONA FIDE TRAVELLERS (BALLYBUNION, CO. KERRY).

MR. MICHAEL FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Sergeant Donaldson, of Ballybunion, County Kerry, on Sunday, 18th April 1897, prevented *bonâ fide* travellers from getting refreshments on the licensed premises of Edward Enright, Ballybunion, although the people so prevented were travelling from Listowel, a distance of ten miles, and tried to exercise their legal right, but, owing to the orders of Sergeant Donaldson, were compelled to leave the licensed premises without getting the necessary refreshments; and whether, owing to the fact that a very large number of tourists and the general public travel by the Lartigue railway to this well known seaside place, some inquiry will be made into the action of Sergeant Donaldson?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It appears that on the date mentioned two men, who were not tourists, but the guard and engine driver of one of the trains, entered the licensed premises referred to, and the Sergeant, having satisfied himself that they resided at Listowel, of which fact he was not previously aware, the men refreshed themselves without being in any way prevented. The publican in question was fined for a breach of the Sunday Closing Act in January last. The action of the Sergeant, under the circumstances, was right and proper, and does not call for further notice. There will be no improper interference with the privileges of *bonâ fide* travellers at Ballybunion.

PORT OF NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state whether a copy of the arbitrator's award in the case of the Port of Ness Harbour, Island of Lewis, has yet been received at the Scottish Office?

MR. H. T. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews Burghs): My right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate has asked me to state that the answer is in the affirmative.

MINES AND QUARRIES (STATISTICS).

MR. DAVID THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state when the summaries of statistics relating to mines and quarries for 1896 will be issued; whether he is aware that they were issued last year on 13th March; and if he is further aware that much of the value and interest attaching to them is lost by issuing them at so late a date after the period to which they relate?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): The summaries ought to have been issued some days ago, but there has been delay on the part of the lithographers who are printing the plans. A promise, however, has been given that they will be issued this afternoon. The hon. Member is mistaken as to the date of issue last year; it was not March the 13th, but June the 24th, the delay being due to the difficulty of getting in the quarry returns which were appearing in the summaries for the first time. Every effort is made to issue the summaries at the earliest possible date, but some of the quarry returns are not due till the 1st March, and I do not think it would be possible to issue them much sooner.

ARDAGH BURIAL GROUND.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether it is true that the Local Government Board have, without previous inquiry, but solely on the letter of a local landlord to the Board of Guardians of Longford Union, closed the Ardagh Burial Ground by sealed order; (2) whether such action is in accordance with the law; and (3) was the sealed order brought before him for approval before being issued?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In August 1892, the Guardians of the Longford Union, acting as the Burial Board, asked the Local Government Board to hold an Inquiry into the condition of the two burial grounds in Ardagh, and the Inquiry was held in December of the same year. With reference to the second paragraph, I have to state that the requirements of Section 163 of the Public Health Act were duly complied with in this case. The answer to the third paragraph is in the negative. It was not until the Board found that their continued efforts to induce the Guardians to take steps to provide a fresh burial ground were fruitless, that they made their closing order on the present occasion.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a communication from the Guardians stating that in their opinion there was abundant room in the churchyards had been received?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes; but an Inquiry was held by the Local Government Board, and I gather that in their judgment as to the fact there was no doubt whatever.

WAR RISKS (BRITISH SHIPS).

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, when he is considering any proposed scheme for the insurance of British ships and cargoes against war risks in time of war, he will consider the advisability of taxing British shipping for its own protection, and not throw the cost of insuring a special industry on the taxes of the general population?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think it would be premature to answer questions on this subject until the Government have come to some provisional conclusion, at all events as to the practicability of any scheme or as to the nature of the scheme that should be adopted; but I may point out that, if insurances of the kind referred to by the hon. Member were set on foot, it would not be in the interests of the shipowning community, but in those of the British consumers as a whole. It would be solely in the interests of the latter that public funds would be used.

MR. O'KELLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that such protection would not be at all in the interests of Ireland?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir; I cannot agree to that proposition. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) asked whether any Government had ever insured vessels and cargoes in war time, and whether such insurances were not effected by private underwriting firms?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I am not aware that any scheme of national insurance has ever been adopted before. But I would remind the House that perhaps I have gone almost too far in answering hypothetical questions on a very incomplete subject of study. ["Hear, hear!"]

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT: (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can conveniently so arrange that the Revenue Departments Estimates may be taken at an early date, in order to afford an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Committee on Post Office Establishments?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I fully recognise the importance of the Vote to which the hon. Gentleman calls attention, and I will take care that when it comes on the Committee shall have a full opportunity of discussing it, but I cannot promise that it will be taken either next Friday or Friday week.

MR. DALY asked whether the Irish Estimates would be taken on Friday week.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said that before the right hon. Gentleman answered that Question he should like to ask him—whether in the event of the Irish Estimates not being concluded on Friday next the discussion would be continued on the following Friday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I will not venture to answer these Questions now, because I might give a pledge which might prove to be inconvenient to hon. Members generally. There is no difference between the House and the Government in reference to matters of this kind. Our sole desire is to meet the wishes of hon. Members. I shall communicate with the usual channels of these negotiations with a view to meet the views of hon. Members opposite and in other parts of the House.

CAPE GARRISON.

MR. J. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been directed to a speech delivered at Dorchester by General Nicholson on the 10th May when inspecting the Batteries of the Royal Artillery which have been ordered to South Africa, and to General Nicholson's exhortation to the soldiers not to think the Boers could shoot as well as was generally reported; and whether the Commander-in-Chief and the authorities at the War Office intend to take notice of observations calculated to embitter the feelings between the British troops and the soldiers of the South African Republic?

MR. BRODRICK: The Secretary of State's attention has been called to General Nicholson's address to his men by the Question of the hon. Member. The remarks attributed to General Nicholson do not appear to call for the intervention of the authorities at the War Office.

GREECE AND THE POWERS.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House any information as to the state of negotiations between the Government of Greece and the Powers. Perhaps I may be pardoned for reminding the right hon. Gentleman of the fact that yesterday in answer to a similar question he appealed to me not to press it, on the ground that negotiations were pending—[The First Lord of the Treasury: "Hear, hear!"]—and that therefore it would not be desirable that he should give any information on the subject. But in another place, in answer to what was practically the same Question, a tolerably full answer was given by the Prime Minister, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me for submitting to him that such a method for dealing with a Question fairly put from this side of the House is not treating the House with that consideration to which it is entitled, above all from its Leader. [*Cheers.*]

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I think the incident to which the right hon. Gentleman refers is an indication of the inconvenience which arises from the double demand made upon us by hon. Gentlemen opposite. One demand is that we should give answers to Questions of which the very shortest notice has been sent to us, and the other demand is that the information given by Ministers in this House should be identical with the information given on the same day by a Minister in the other House. Let me tell the House what happened yesterday—and it is merely an illustration of what has happened two or three times before. At a quarter past three I received notice of the right hon. Gentleman's Question.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I gave it at two o'clock.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I was away at two o'clock; in fact, I was at luncheon. [*Laughter.*] I actually received the notice a little after three. I went straight to the Foreign Office. Lord Salisbury was not there, and his private secretary could not inform me where he was. I waited there until half-past three, when I had to come here to answer questions. I carefully considered all the information at the disposal of the Government, and I came to the conclusion that I should be running a risk of making unnecessary difficulties in the conduct of delicate negotiations if, while these negotiations were going on, I were, without consulting with the Foreign Minister, to give any information to this House. [*Cheers.*] The Foreign Minister, it turns out, as I have since heard, was at Buckingham Palace. He then came down to the House of Lords quite ignorant of the fact that I had received private notice of a question. He was asked a question, and, of course, with that liberty of action which only a Foreign Minister can have—the Minister, in other words, who has all the threads of negotiations in his hands, and who has interviews with foreign ambassadors which no other Minister but the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister has—he very naturally gave all the information in his power. Then the right hon. Gentleman is indignant—no, I will not say indignant—but he makes, not unnaturally, the complaint that the same information is not given in both Houses at the same time. All I can say is, that if either Lord Salisbury or I had received private notice early enough that identical questions were going to be asked, precisely the same answer would have been given in both places. [*Cheers.*] It may perhaps be to the satisfaction of the right hon. Gentleman to know that if the House of Lords yesterday received information which was not vouchsafed to the House of Commons, I shall be able to-day to give this House information which I presume has not yet been given to the House of Lords. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] In answer to the Question he has put to me, I may inform him that the requisite instructions have been received this morning by all the representatives at Athens, and that mediation was offered by them and accepted by Greece. ["Hear, hear!"] I have no further information at present to give the House.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for that answer. I do not propose to take up a moment of the time of the House in entering into any controversy with him as to the earlier part of his answer. I was not indignant—[*cheers*]—because we on this side of the House are getting rather accustomed to this kind of treatment, therefore there was no surprise on our part. [*Cheers.*] I would only say this, that I should have thought that the right hon. Gentleman would have told the Prime Minister that a question was about to be asked, and that he did not feel himself in a position to answer it. Sill, I pass over that, and I hope that in the future the House of Commons will be as well treated as it has been to-day. [*Cheers.*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. J. MORLEY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman what will be the course of business this week and next, and when the South African Vote will be taken?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: As to the South African Vote, we are entirely in the right hon. Gentleman's hands. If he will let me know what arrangement can be come to in the regrettable absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, I will endeavour to carry out his wishes. The first business on Thursday will be the Second Reading of the Prison Made Goods Bill, and the Second Order the Third Reading of the Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill. On Monday the first business will be the Second Reading of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill.

MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has arrived at any decision as to the course of procedure with regard to the Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill, and the Agricultural and Industries (Ireland) Bill, the latter of which I understand is postponed indefinitely?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: These Bills are postponed until Monday. It is possible that on or before that day I may be able to answer the hon. Member's Question, and to make a statement upon the subject.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

SUNDAY CLOSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred from To-morrow till Wednesday 30th June.

INJURIES TO WORKMEN (EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 25th May.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MOTION.

COMMONS (REGULATION).

Bill to abolish the Veto of the Lord of the Manor on the Regulation of a Common, under the Commons Act 1876, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Luttrell, Mr. Seale-Hayne, Sir John Brunner, and Sir Joseph Leese; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Wednesday 19th May, and to be printed.—[Bill 240.]

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

As amended, considered; to be Read a Third time upon Thursday.

WAYS AND MEANS [10TH MAY] (BUDGET RESOLUTION).

Resolution reported;

TEA.

"That the Duty of Customs now payable on Tea shall continue to be charged, levied, and paid on and after the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, until the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the importation thereof into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say): Tea . . the pound . Four Pence."

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the Resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 30th April, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

FINANCE BILL.

"To grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue," presented, and Read the First time ; to be Read a Second time upon Thursday, and to be printed.—[Bill 241.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

METROPOLITAN AND OTHER POLICE COURTS BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [3rd May], "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

Question again proposed. Debate resumed.

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.), continuing his speech, which was interrupted by the operation of the 12 o'clock Rule on 3rd May, said he had had an opportunity since he last spoke of reading the speech of the Under Secretary for the Home Department in introducing the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the expenses entailed by the Bill would be about £6,400. But they ought to know the basis upon which this sum had been estimated, and the specific items of which it was composed. With regard to the salaries of the clerks in the police-courts, he found that the total amount was about £19,000 per annum. They ought to have been informed by what percentage it was intended to increase these salaries. He had been told, in answer to a question, that it was intended to increase the salary of the chief clerk by £100, and that of the second clerk by £50 ; but there was no information with regard to the increase in the salaries of the remainder of the clerks. With regard to the increase in the salary of the chief clerk he could not think that that estimate had been fairly made. It must be remembered that the chief clerks in the Metropolitan police-courts were gentlemen of very great and, in many cases, unique experience ; and he did not think that the maximum of £600 now proposed was adequate for such an office. Inevitably these clerks would compare their salaries with those received by clerks to Justices in the several Petty Sessional Divisions in the Metropolis, and they would find that their salaries were very much lower, and would bring pressure at the Home Office to increase the maximum very much beyond the limit now contemplated. As to the proposed increased borrowing powers, they had been informed that the money was to be spent in two directions—in enfranchising the leasehold tenures of the building and also on erecting further buildings. But surely they ought to have been informed what proportion of the money was to be spent in the one direction and what in the other. Although that information had not been given, they knew that a very large expenditure on bricks and mortar was contemplated. The House was left in the dark so far as specific information was concerned, but they knew that the Bill proposed to remove two statutory bars now existing upon expenditure. With regard to the promise that £7,000 should be paid annually by the Treasury in respect of services rendered by the police to the Houses of Parliament, he thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for recognising that there should be an authoritative record of this engagement. It appeared to him, however, that that record should be made before and not after the Bill passed. There was one further item which ought to be included in the record. He referred to the expenditure upon the Extradition Court at Bow Street. That court was not a Metropolitan but a National institution, and clearly the Exchequer and not the ratepayers should pay for it. He understood the justice of this claim was admitted, but they ought to know in black and white what contribution was to be made by the Treasury in respect of the expenses of that court. He appealed to the Members for Richmond, Croydon, West Ham and other parts of the home counties which were included within the Metropolitan police district, to join in opposing the Bill. These districts would have to meet a double expense, first for their own Petty Sessional Courts, and, secondly, the cost of the Metropolitan police-courts, in which they had no interest as ratepayers. He could not understand what reasons could be alleged for precipitate haste in passing this Bill. The circumstances were different from what they were when the late Government brought forward a similar Bill. This question, with others, had since been referred to a Commission, and it seemed scarcely respectful to the Royal Commission for the House to forestall its decision by transferring these charges from the Treasury to the Metropolitan ratepayers. It might be said that it was absolutely necessary that the salaries of the clerks should be raised, and that new buildings should be erected. Well, if the Government would limit the Bill to these two purposes, without altering the present incidence, he, for one, would not oppose it. But in its present shape, he must offer it the most determined opposition. He moved to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."

*Mr. CHARLES HARRISON (Plymouth) seconded the Amendment. He said the first proposal of the Bill was to transfer the staff of the London police-courts, other than magistrates, from the Consolidated Fund to the Metropolitan Police Fund.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) said that the hon. Member was under a misapprehension. The Bill transferred nothing from the Consolidated Fund to the Police Fund. It did not interfere with any payment made out of the Consolidated Fund.

*Mr. HARRISON observed that that might be the intention of the right hon. Gentleman, but the language of the Bill would not carry it out. At all events, the cost of the police-courts staff, chief clerks and others, and their superannuation would, by the Bill, be thrown on the Metropolitan Local Police Fund, and the general taxpayer would be relieved. The second object of the Bill was to transfer the police-court buildings and their maintenance, now supported by funds voted by Parliament, from the Office of Works to the Receiver General, which would throw the expenses of these courts upon the Metropolis Police Fund. The only argument which had been urged in support of that proposal was that the Metropolitan police area was really the Municipal area for the Metropolis. But it was no such thing; it was an Imperial area, and the richest part of it, the City of London, with its 4½ millions of rateable property, contributed nothing towards the Metropolitan police. While the richest part of the Metropolis was taken out of the police area, a large area outside, extending some 15 or 20 miles round about London, was included in it. This extension was made because it was from the first intended to form an Imperial area for rating and policing. It included four corporations or towns, the whole of Middlesex, and parts of four other counties, or 668 square miles in all. There seemed to him to be no reason why any portion of this Imperial expenditure, whether for the police-court staffs or for buildings, should be thrown upon the Metropolitan ratepayers. So Imperial was the police force that its duties were not confined to the area which he had described. It was an area of criminal assize for a vast population beyond that of the mere Metropolis, and its police were employed at Her Majesty's dockyards at Devonport, Plymouth, Sheerness, and other places. The force was also employed at Imperial functions, and to protect the House of Commons. That being the state of the case, why should the buildings required for carrying on what was Imperial administration be thrown upon the local fund instead of being defrayed out of sums voted by Parliament? There was no intention to make any change in regard to the payment of the Metropolitan police magistrates, who would still be paid out of funds voted by Parliament. Why then should the staff of clerks be treated separately, and why should the cost of the buildings and the expenses be thrown upon the Police Fund, which is contributed by ratepayers? In 1839, when the Receiver was appointed, the ratepayers had to provide the court buildings, but as they came to be used more and more for Imperial purposes an Act was passed in 1871 transferring them from the Receiver General of Police and from local rate to funds contributed by the Imperial taxpayer. This Bill proposed to undo the arrangements made in 1871, and to throw the cost of the courts back again upon local funds. It was suggested that the Government would take care that no expense should be thrown upon the ratepayers, but would they assent to a provision to secure the ratepayers against extra burdens? When the force was first established in 1829 it was to be supported by a rate not exceeding 8d. in the pound. In 1868 the sum was increased to 9d., the Government contributing 4d. Upon the faith of the understanding as to the rate, leases had been granted and liabilities assumed; but if the proposal of the Government were carried the effect would be to enlarge the expenses, to alter the conditions of contracts, and to do away with the conditions which limited the ratepayers' liability to a rate not exceeding 9d. in the pound. In 1861 and in 1890, there being till then no power to provide pensions, Parliament imposed an additional liability on the locality, and something like £255,000 per annum was now paid for pensions which had been removed from the control of Parliament. The pensions were not subject to any control either by the ratepayers or by Parliament. The matter was in the hands of the Home Secretary and the Receiver General. A subordinate Imperial officer, uncontrolled by Parliament, spent about £1,447,000 per annum. In this case representation and taxation were absolutely divorced. No control was exercised over the Fund, and what had been the result? Why, the Receiver General had always levied up to the full amount of the 9d. rate, and the levy had been far in excess of the expenditure. The excess during the past 20 years had amounted to £245,000. It was suggested that it had been necessary to raise this extra amount to provide a working balance for the fund, but if the fund contributed by ratepayers were worked as other and with other funds, similarly administered, there was no necessity why one set of ratepayers of years past should provide this large sum. If the Police Fund were under the control of the ratepayers there would not be that excess. The Receiver General was an official over whom neither that House nor the ratepayers had any control, and the result was that his administration had been extravagant. The present Bill would lead to further uncontrolled extravagance. The cost of the police was 4s. 7·36d. per inhabitant, or on rateable value 8·33d. In Birmingham the cost was only 2s. 7d. per inhabitant, or 6·76d. on rateable value. He maintained that if any transfer of business were to be effected it ought not to be effected as proposed by this Bill. He urged that the expenses of the police-courts ought not to be thrown on local funds, that the Act of 1871, under which the buildings were transferred to the Commissioners of Works, ought not to be repealed, and that the staffs, as well as the magistrates, ought to be paid out of Imperial funds. There was no justification for burdening the ratepayers in what was really an Imperial area with the whole cost of the administration of public justice.

Mr. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said that this Bill was of great concern to the Metropolis, not only within the four walls of the Bill itself, but also because it was part of a large and general question. He did not refer to the question of the control of the police, though he thought that might fairly be raised. But he wished to look on this Bill from a financial point of view. London had a considerable number of items on both sides of the account with the Treasury. On the one side were the contributions to London in aid of the rates, which were derived through various channels, and on the other side there were the expenses which London had to incur, a considerable portion of which were undoubtedly incurred for Imperial purposes. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill admitted that there were several charges falling upon London, which he reckoned at £7,000 a year, which would not fall on London but for her Imperial situation. He did not admit that the right hon. Gentleman had any right to take a particular item in police expenditure and set it against what was proposed to be put on London by this Bill. He did not think it was a reasonable or proper way of proceeding to isolate individual items on the one side or the other of the account, and say these ought to be borne by London. He contended that if the present situation in London were to be altered by this Bill, it ought to be shown that the contribution in aid of local rates in London was too large by the amount with which the Bill dealt.

What, then, was the situation in London? The main grievance lay in a most important point. The amount of the licence duties contributed under the Act of 1888, which is given back to London, was only 13 per cent. of the whole, the remaining 87 per cent. going to the rest of the country. If London's share were calculated by population, a much larger proportion than that would be due, and if it went by rateable value, then the rateable value of London was one-fifth of the whole rateable value of the country, which would make her share 20 per cent. As a matter of fact London received 21 per cent. of the grant from the probate duties. That being the recognised proportion, the amount received from the licence duties put London at a very great disadvantage indeed—a disadvantage of between £200,000 and £300,000 a year. That grievance had been more or less recognised by the occupants of the Front Bench on both sides of the House. He passed from that point to other and larger grievances in connection with contributions to local rates. Recent legislation had put London at a greater disadvantage still. There was the Agricultural Rating Act. What were the contributions that individuals living in London had to make to that. Quite apart from the question whether it was a good or a bad Act, it placed London at a great disadvantage so far as contributions to local purposes were concerned. Then there was the Voluntary Schools Bill. The effect of that Bill would be again to put London at a very serious disadvantage, and the method in which the Government had chosen to deal with School Boards, the balance between London and the rest of the country had been still more altered. Having treated London in that way the Government now came forward with their Bill to deprive London of another advantage. On the other hand, what was it proposed to do for London? It was proposed to give London a sum of £7,000 a year, whereas the Bill made it absolutely incumbent on London to pay the expenses to which it referred. He did not admit that £7,000 was anything like enough, and it would depend upon the Vote of the House of Commons and would be uncertain. The right hon. Gentleman dwelt on the anomaly of London police courts being held on leasehold terms; one of the objects of the Bill was to secure the purchase of the freehold, and a large sum of money would undoubtedly have to be spent for that purpose. Well, they were going to throw all this expense upon them and that was most inadequately met by £7,000 a year. The Bill came to a large sum indeed—he believed 10 or 12 thousand a year—and that would not cover it. They proposed to give them £7,000 for the service rendered by the police. Why was it not given long before now? They were paying for the services of the police in that House and elsewhere, and that Bill did not give them in the least adequate return. In other words, they would be losers without gaining anything in return. This Bill, in fact, created an additional charge on London rates. Formerly the expenditure on the police was limited to a 9d. rate, the Government paying in proportion. He thought that the House ought to know how this 9d. rate stood. He showed from figures which he quoted that the expenditure on the police was rising higher in proportion than the property that they had to protect. Then there was another point, and that was the confusion of areas that the present system brought about. The hon. Member seemed to think that this Bill affected only the Metropolis, but that was a mistake, and a new grievance was about to be started between London and the outside authorities. Some rearrangement would be unavoidable. These questions were always coming up in connection with London finance, and he was afraid that they were making confusion worse confounded.

MR. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) thought there was a good deal of truth in what was said by the hon. Member. London was willing to pay its charges in connection with the police courts as in all other matters. ["Hear, hear!"] There might be a question raised as to Bow Street, which was, however, a separate matter. He supported the Bill on the understanding that it was to be the beginning of the readjusting of affairs as to London, which he regarded as unfairly treated in comparison with other parts of the country. London was receiving less than other parts of what was going. He referred to the Beer Bill and the Voluntary Schools Bill as examples to show that London was getting less than it ought. No doubt these were matters which might be laughed at, but they were very serious for London itself. ["Hear, hear!"] If London were not so uniformly of one colour—if it were partly Radical and partly Irish Nationalist—it might receive closer attention from the Government. He supported this Bill, but he hoped that the Metropolis would receive the same treatment as other parts of the country. In parts London was rich, but they were bound to point out that there were poor parts of London for which they ought to claim the full share of these grants.

MR. J. CALDWELL (Lanark, Mid) said he opposed a Bill similar to this, which was introduced by the Liberal Government, and he must oppose this Measure. He admitted that the London people had a certain grievance so far as the probate and the licence duties were concerned. Every other portion of the United Kingdom got its fair share of the probate and the licence duties, and he never could understand how it was that London did not. Doubtless the amount of which London was deprived in respect to those duties was considerably larger than any sum it could possibly get under this Bill. It was also true that London had a grievance in regard to agricultural rating, Voluntary Schools, and Board Schools; but then against whom had it that grievance? Against the other portions of England only, because whatever London was deprived of in respect of those matters by the action of Parliament, went to the rest of England. As between London and Scotland and Ireland there was no grievance. There was no international grievance because Scotland and Ireland got their proportion whether London got its proper proportion or not. In what respect, then, had the people of Scotland and Ireland a grievance as regarded this Bill? The Bill professed to do away with the objection taken on the Estimates that the expenses of the metropolitan police courts were defrayed out of Imperial funds, whereas those of the police courts in every provincial town were paid out of local funds. The contention of the objectors was admitted to be sound, but how did the Government suggest it should be met? It was proposed that the buildings, for instance, should be handed over to the London authorities. Why should the buildings be so dealt with? In Scotland and Ireland the expenses attending such buildings were borne by the local rates. Upon what principle, therefore, if effect were to be given to the just contention he had previously mentioned, should the buildings in London be handed over as a present to the London authorities? Again, it was proposed that the salaries of the magistrates, amounting to £37,700, should be borne by the Consolidated Fund as at present. In the provinces of England, and other parts of the United Kingdom, the salaries of the magistrates were paid out of the local rates. Furthermore, the pensions of the magistrates were to be borne by Imperial funds, and they amounted to upwards of £7,000. In all about £45,000 was to be charged to the Consolidated Fund, with the result that these subjects would be withdrawn from the criticism of the House. He would like to know what was the interpretation put on Section 9 of the Metropolitan Police Courts Act, 1839? That section provided that an annual sum not exceeding £50,000 was to be paid out of the Imperial funds for the purpose of the police courts. That section was to remain in force, and therefore a sum up to £50,000 might be paid. The fees were not to be paid into the Imperial Treasury, but were to be given to the police courts. Was it meant that, in addition to the £45,000 for salaries and pensions, about £50,000 was to be given annually, and no new provision made as to fees? Another objection to the Measure was that in reality it was a pension Bill. There was no provision in the appointment of clerks and other officials as to pensions, but the Bill entitled the present holders of offices to pensions. There was something to be said in favour of giving pensions to those appointed in the future, but it was hardly proper to spring this proposal as to present office holders upon the House. He mentioned that the Bill in no sense provided that equality of treatment which was said to be the reason for its introduction. There was to be a transaction between the Treasury on the one hand and London on the other, and in the end the Imperial taxpayer would be in a much worse position than he was in at present.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) wished to refer to the position which the extra-metropolitan areas would occupy under this Bill. As far as he understood, there were districts in Essex, Surrey, and parts of Middlesex which maintained their own police-courts at the present day, but which, under this Bill, would also contribute to the cost of the London courts. He knew there was some considerable misapprehension in these extra-metropolitan districts as to the effect of this Measure, and he thought they ought to have that difficulty cleared away before they were called upon to vote for the Second Reading. It appeared to him that the districts which were already discharging their own local affairs satisfactorily should not be called upon, under such a system as this, to contribute to other districts in which they had no particular concern.

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) thought it would be well if the Government would accept the wise advice of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark that it would be better to leave things as they are. The two questions which had come out in that Debate were those of control and of money. With regard to this question of control, if this Bill passed they would create a scandal of no slight magnitude. He quite admitted that theoretically the police-courts should be given over to the control of the local authority, but in London, unlike other towns, they had no properly constituted local authority, and, therefore, it was proposed to give the courts over to the control of a mysterious functionary called the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police. He did not think anybody knew exactly who he was, but the effect of this Bill would be that he would be empowered to do anything he pleased with public money. Practically speaking, he would be responsible to no man. He agreed the present position was anomalous, but it had this advantage, that when they discussed the Estimates these courts came before them, and they could criticise any extravagance in salaries, any extravagance connected with the buildings, or any scandal that arose in connection with the courts. That control would disappear if the courts passed into the hands of the Receiver, and, therefore, on that ground, he hoped the House would refuse to pass the Bill. He would deal for one moment with the question of money. The hon. Member for West Ham had had suggested to him the little trouble the outside areas would get into, financially, if the Bill were passed, and he had asked what was the cost that would be thrown on those areas. The right hon. Gentleman answered that question when he was explaining the Bill the other night. He said a charge would be thrown upon them, but it was a very small one. He would ask the hon. Member for West Ham not to rely on that. Whenever these bad principles were introduced into finance, they were always asked to assent because it was such a little thing. He commended to his hon. Friend the suggestion he had received from his own conscience to oppose the Bill, because it was not satisfactory that any charge should be thrown on these outside areas for this purpose. The right hon. Gentleman said, that if the £7,000 were not sufficient, the Treasury would make some addition to it. That was one of those slippery remarks—

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS did not think the hon. Gentleman could find that in his speech. What he stated was that the Treasury would give £7,000 for an ordinary Session, but that if there was an autumn Session or a long Session that amount would be increased.

Mr. LOUGH said that was his point—that if there was any loss, and representations were made to the Treasury, they would probably increase the amount. This was another suggestion to get the Bill through. He protested against their going on in a matter of this kind, in which there was no necessity to do anything under all these disadvantageous circumstances. The hon. Member for North Islington said he should vote for the Bill in the hope that this was the beginning of a general readjustment. This was a readjustment of £10,000 or £20,000 against London, and they should have no more of these financial scandals against the Metropolis attempted until, as the hon. Member for North Islington said, the whole matter was treated in a broad, liberal, and proper spirit. Because the finance of the Bill was bad, and because there would really be no control over these courts if the Bill passed, he hoped the House would agree to reject it.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said that during the Debate many very important questions had been raised, but they had nothing to do with the Bill. [*Opposition cries of* "Oh!"] The Bill did not raise them in any form, and he hoped hon. Gentlemen would not think him discourteous if he did not go outside its scope. It was a very simple Measure. At the present time, he thought all hon. Members would admit, the management of the courts and of the stations was simply a mass of confusion, and when business matters were managed in a confused, mixed, and unsatisfactory way there was always a loss. They had at this moment police-courts belonging to the Office of Works where the freehold was vested in the Receiver. There were other cases where the police-courts and the police-stations were one and the same building, half of which belonged to the Office of Works and for half of which the Receiver was responsible, and there was the case of a site part of which was leasehold and part belonged to the Receiver. He was sure that no business man would in his own affairs tolerate for a moment the existence of the state of things resulting from such divided control. The hon. Member for Bethnal Green made some extravagant references to what this Bill was going to do with regard to salaries. It was simply a matter of removing the limit placed on the clerks' salaries by an Act nearly 60 years old. The salaries were very small, but a Departmental Committee of the Treasury had reported in favour of their increase. The Treasury resolved to increase them, but found themselves barred by this old Act. The scale of increase was very limited, and the amount involved would not in the first instance be more than £270, and would ultimately be about £1,000. On the other hand, the sums received by police-court clerks for furnishing copies of depositions, amounting to £700 a year, would in future be paid into the Police Fund. With regard to the outside areas, even supposing nothing was paid by the Treasury, the burden thrown on the whole of Essex would be £194 on an assessable value of over one million sterling. In the case of Surrey the amount would be £271, or 1-25th of a penny in the pound. The total amount which would come out of the Metropolitan Police Fund under the Bill was £5,749, and against that there was paid into the fund £7,000 in respect of the services rendered by the police to the Houses of Parliament, besides a debt of £7,000 cancelled by the Treasury, and the buildings would be handed over to the fund. The expenditure of the money would be just as much within the purview of Parliament through the Home Secretary and the Receiver as it was now. With regard to the Extradition Court, his own opinion was that the demand that some consideration should be paid into the Police Fund in respect of it was a just one. He would communicate with the Treasury, and he was inclined to think that the Treasury would view the request with favour. Looking at the matter as a whole, he was disposed to think the advantage was with the Police Fund and the ratepayers, and that the Treasury had not made quite as good a bargain as they might have made. He desired to give a word of warning to the outside districts. The alternative was to make a separate rating area, and that was always objectionable, or to keep that a separate account with regard to the London police-courts, which would involve an enormous amount of labour and expense. This expense would fall on the Police Fund, and the outside areas would have to bear their share, while the £7,000 in respect of the police at the Houses of Parliament would be paid in for the advantage of the county of London only. The Bill would put the administration of the police-courts on a businesslike footing, and instead of throwing any extra burden on the ratepayers, would benefit the Police Fund to the extent of £1,500.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said, with the exception of the argument that from the business point of view this reform should take place, the right hon. Gentleman had given no reason why it should take place at the present moment. The present arrangement had in practice worked fairly well, and there was certainly no immediate hurry in regard to the transfer. He objected to a question of this character being dealt with in piecemeal fashion. At present the House of Commons had the opportunity of exercising some control over the expenditure of this police fund, but if they agreed to the proposals of the Government they would part with their control over this very large sum, which came partly from Imperial sources and partly from local rates. He did not wish to cast any imputation on the Home Secretary or the Receiver General, but he was certainly of opinion that they ought to retain the power to move reductions of the salaries of the officials who administered the police fund. If the Government thought that these expenses ought to be defrayed municipally, why did they not grant London municipal control over the police? As long as the Government chose to exercise Imperial control over the police, no additional burdens in respect of that force ought to be placed on the shoulders of the ratepayers. Regarded both from the point of view of the ratepayers' control over the police, and from the point of view of Parliamentary control over the Estimates, this Bill was a retrograde Measure. The right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the question whether this Measure would or would not throw some additional burdens on the police fund, and had said that in his opinion the £7,000 which he proposed to supply would make up for any additional charge on the fund. But there were Estimates worked out by the statistical officer of the London County Council, and his calculation, founded on the proposed increase of salaries, and on the large increase of expenditure that would be incurred by the acquisition of the freeholds of the police courts, was that there would be an additional charge of over £9,000. There were under the existing law statutory limits to the officials' salaries, and to the capital expenditure upon buildings, but the right hon. Gentleman proposed to get rid of these limits, and the past administration of the police fund did not encourage Members to think that when these limits were abolished there would be much economy.

*MR. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) asked why the hon. Member did not pass equally severe criticisms on the Bill brought in by the right hon. Member for East Fife in 1894 or 1895? [Mr. BUXTON: "I am now in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility."] The reasons why it was not proposed by Her Majesty's Government to transfer the police courts to the London County Council were the same good reasons as influenced the right hon. Member for East Fife not to make that transfer. The statutory limits which had been referred to as removed by this Bill he regarded as public mischiefs. The limits on the salaries of the clerks led to their leaving London and taking service under provincial authorities, who paid them better. That showed that the market rate of payment was not being paid in London. Then the statutory limit upon capital expenditure upon buildings resulted in an unwillingness to spend sufficient public money for the purpose of having suitable buildings. There was no foundation for the fear that the House would be deprived of the control which it had hitherto exercised. But the kind of control which prevailed now was almost as great a public mischief as the statutory limitations. That control amounted practically to opposition to every kind of expenditure, and the Home Office had the greatest difficulty in inducing the officials of the Treasury, who feared what might be said in Parliament, to consent to any expenditure on the service of these police courts. The Treasury believed that the House had a radical objection to spending public money on local objects, and the result was that the police courts were not as efficiently provided for as they would be if this Bill were passed. The area affected by the Bill returned 88 Members to that House. Were they incapable of moving reductions on the Vote for the Receiver's salary? Then the accounts for the Metropolitan police were presented to Parliament annually in detail, and afforded the amplest opportunity for criticism. They knew from sad experience in the past that the voices of 88 Members were quite sufficiently powerful to influence the conduct of Ministers, and there was the indisputable fact that Debates and Questions asked in that House attracted a good deal more attention among Londoners than would be attracted by any number of debates on the same subject in any County Council that could be created. In the proposals of the Government he saw a very practical, if not a theoretically perfect, solution of a difficulty which ought to be dealt with in the interests of the public.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."—The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 87.—(Division List, No. 201.)

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a Second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, Etc.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) proposed to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words, "upon this day six months." He said that the Bill was one of those which rose like spirits from the vasty deep, and required explanation. He should certainly show the House that this particular Bill required some explanation. In some cases, no doubt, as, for instance, in the case of enactments referring to friendly societies, it was necessary for them to be consolidated, for the assistance of the public; but it was not so important in Acts of this sort, because legal experts only were concerned with them. The so-called Consolidation Bills were commonly not Consolidation Bills at all. They arose in this way. A Department, when they had to carry into effect the wisdom of Parliament, embodied in a series of Acts, were confronted every day by new and sometimes great difficulties which they accumulated and presented to Parliament for removal. Then came what was called a Consolidation Bill, and such was the ingenuity in Government Departments that they could persuade even his hon. Friend the Solicitor General that a change in the law was not a change in the law. Consequently, Consolidation Bills sometimes embodied changes in the law, not on the merits, but simply for the convenience of a Department.

> "The merchant to secure his treasure
> Conveys it in a borrowed name.
> Euphelia serves to grace my measure,
> But Chloe is my real flame."

This Bill did alter the law. No Minister was responsible for the Bill, and that was why the universal weightbearer, the Secretary to the Treasury, had to move the Second Reading, instead of some high legal authority. The Bill was introduced last year, and in speaking of it in the House of Lords on July 30th 1896, the Lord Chancellor said:—

> "Some years ago it was the practice to pass these Bills through the House of Commons with the simple statement that they were Consolidation Bills."

If the Lord Chancellor meant that these Bills had been exempt from the ordinary procedure of the House, he was entirely wrong. The Lord Chancellor continued:

> "The Committee examined, word by word and line by line, everything that had been done in the way of alteration. . . . It would not be possible to get Members of the House of Commons or of their Lordships' House, to go through this laborious and careful work, if it was afterwards to be cast aside at the instance of any one Member who thought he would take an opportunity to amend the law where he thought it defective. If that system were pursued, it would be absolutely impossible to pursue this most useful work. . . Whether any other system of doing this work could be contrived, or whether the Gentleman (who was not one of the six Members who gave their assistance) could do it better or not, the whole system must break down if Amendments were to be made on Bills of this kind, and it was hopeless to attempt anything like consolidation. This Bill of 93 clauses was not to become law because of this objection. It only showed what mischief might be done. If the practice were not suppressed by the action of the House, and in another place, he, for one, would hesitate to ask his noble Friends to waste their time on work which might be perfectly useless. . . . The House of Commons should take means to prevent so gross an abuse."

It would be false modesty to affect not to know that the "any one Member" referred to by the Lord Chancellor was himself. [*Laughter.*]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member seems to be replying to a Debate in the House of Lords, which is out of order.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that he had not intended to do that.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is out of order to refer to the Debate, and the hon. Member is not only referring to it, but is replying to a speech by the Lord Chancellor.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that to contend that, because the Bill had been examined by this Joint Committee, it must therefore be withdrawn from the consideration of the House, was a contention against which he must protest. The mere breathing over the Bill of the magic word "consolidation," did not exempt it from the ordinary procedure. A Consolidation Bill was one which consolidated all the statutes relating to one subject; but this Bill did not fulfil that definition. It did not deal with the packet service, with the telephones, the telegraphs, or the parcels post. It only consolidated part of the law. The memorandum of the Bill claimed for it that it made "such alterations of the law only as are required for uniformity of expression and adaptation to existing law and practice, and does not embody any substantial amendment of the law." Surely the House of Commons ought to be allowed to form its own opinion on that subject. He would show that substantial amendments of the law were made. The memorandum of the Bill said:—

> "It is identical with that which passed the Joint Committee last year, except that Clauses 27 and 32 have been altered so as to give effect to the repeals effected by the Public Health Act of last Session (59 and 60 Vict. c. 19), and words have been introduced in Clause 74 to make it clear that the operation of s. 2 of the Public Accounts and Charges Act 1891 (54 and 55 Vict. c. 24) is preserved."

The Bill of last year, which was said to be identical with this one, provided that, in spite of any other Act of Parliament, the fines, forfeitures, and other sums should be paid into the Exchequer. But it was then discovered by the Solons of the Committee, whose work was too sacred to be touched, that they had practically repealed the Act of 1891, which provided that all money directed by the Treasury to be applied as an appropriation in aid, should be so applied without being paid into the Treasury. Section 2 of the present Bill gave the Treasury power to fix the rates and charges on postal packets. That applied to all postal packets; and therefore it took away the express statutory right of newspapers to be carried for a halfpenny. Section 20, again, which prescribed certain rules for the registration of newspapers, now restricted the rules which were before general. Not only that, it provided that every page of a newspaper after the first should bear the title and date of publication, wholly or in part. The words, "the whole or part of," were quite new. The decisions of the Courts were based upon the phraseology of Acts of Parliament, and the alteration of that phraseology might mean the destruction of a whole fabric of decisions of the Courts upon which the law was at present administered. That was one of the dangers of this Consolidation Bill. He did not object to consolidation. He objected to an advantage being taken of consolidation to alter the law, as in the case of the present Bill, and he protested against such action being coupled with the declaration that the House should not closely examine Bills of this character. Every Bill that came into the House should be subjected to the examination of the House. He had never known a Bill that had not left the House the better for that examination, and in the case of a Bill of this kind, with numerous provisions dealing with complicated matters, the most careful consideration was absolutely necessary. The Bill was presented to the House in the false guise of a Consolidation Bill. It was meant to further the small conveniences of an overworked and perhaps not very capable Department. He knew of no Department which was so continually construing Acts of Parliament, and was so absolutely incapable of doing it than the Post Office Department. He could give twenty instances of the incapacity of Post Office officials to construe Acts of Parliament, and as the Bill was introduced to relieve them of the difficulty of construing Acts of Parliament by altering the Acts to the way they wanted to construe them that he objected to the Bill.

MR. BARTLEY seconded the Amendment. He thought the gradual consolidation of statutes was a valuable work, and that Bills having that object in view should be allowed to pass rapidly through the House. But the danger of most Consolidation Bills was that opportunity was taken to put, as the Departments thought, a certain number of things right, but which really amounted to amendments of the law. That was his hon. Friend's objection to the Bill, and he formally seconded his hon. Friend's Amendment in order that the House might have a statement as to the real effect of the Bill.

MR. H. C. F. LUTTRELL (Devon, Tavistock) said his objection to the Bill was not so much that it left out things but that it consolidated faults. A fault was bad, but consolidated faults were worse. There was one fault particularly which he thought most objectionable. Under Clause 46 of the Bill the Postmaster General was to have power, with the consent of the Treasury, to purchase land for the purposes of the Post Office; and the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act was to apply. Under that Act it was possible for a man who was unwilling to sell his land to get 10 or 15, and indeed in some cases 20 per cent. more for his land because it was taken from him compulsorily. That was a most objectionable provision, because it was a direct incentive to a landowner to refuse to give his land for any public or useful purpose. It was quite true that the interests of private owners of land should be safeguarded; but they should not encourage private owners to behave badly to the public; and he contended that by the application of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act they were giving a direct inducement to landowners to behave badly to the public. He hoped, therefore, the Government would omit the application of that Act to purchasers of land under the Bill.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) appealed to his hon. Friend the Member for King's Lynn to withdraw his opposition to the Second Reading, in order that Amendments might be moved to the Bill in Committee. The Bill afforded the first opportunity for many years of moving Amendments to the present Post Office law, and it was probable there would not be such a chance again for many years to come. He had put down several Amendments—one of which was that the Postmaster General should be a Member of the House of Commons—which he was sure would be acceptable to the people of the country, and under the circumstances he trusted his hon. Friend would not go to a Division against the Second Reading.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said the work done by the Joint Committee was exceedingly laborious and difficult; it was largely done by skilled draftsmen, and there were also skilled lawyers upon the Committee. The work must be in a certain degree imperfect—that much should be conceded to human frailty—but every care was taken to prevent any mistake or any substantial alteration of the law. They might have to deal with from 20 to 40 Acts of Parliament in preparing a Consolidation Bill, and it was almost impossible to avoid infinitesimal alterations in the law. It was certainly necessary to alter the phraseology. He did not want to enter into any question which had arisen between the Lord Chancellor and an equally great luminary of that House as to whether the Lord Chancellor took the right view of what ought to be taken in the House of Commons, but he did say all this work done by the Joint Committee was work of a character which could not be done there. This was work which ought to be tenderly regarded by both Houses of Parliament if it had been done honestly, as it certainly had. His hon. Friend the Member for King's Lynn complained that there had been an alteration in the law, while his hon. Friend the Member for Tavistock said they ought to take this opportunity of legislating with reference to the Lands Clauses Act of 1845. The hon. Member for Canterbury had hailed this as a splendid opportunity for altering the whole scope of the Post Office law, but if that course were adopted it was no use putting this irksome labour upon the Committee, and they had better give up consolidation altogether. He did not think Consolidation Acts ought to be discouraged, on the contrary, he thought that the fault of our legislation was that we did not legislate scientifically. Every Member of that House had the right to propose Amendments to a Bill, and some Amendments were adopted under pressure or for Parliamentary reasons, without sufficient appreciation of the scope of the change which would be made in a particular Act. For his own part he should like to see the Houses of Parliament laying down the principle as to what the law should be in a series of Resolutions, and leaving it to skilled persons to frame the law in accordance with those Resolutions, as was done in some foreign Legislatures. He was afraid, however, he could hardly look forward to so conservative an Assembly as our own adopting such a system. In the long Bill they were now considering he did not think the hon. Member for King's Lynn could point to any important change in the law. The point he had referred to came before the joint Committee, and it was resolved to insert the words to which attention had been drawn in order to preserve the law as it existed. As to the right of a newspaper to be carried for a halfpenny, he did not think that was changed. He would suggest that in future a list should be made of all those cases in which the Joint Committee considered they had altered the law at all, and that this list should be placed in front of the Consolidation Bill when it came to be considered by Parliament. But if they were to have Consolidation Bills criticised at length in that House, or if the complaint was to be made that they did not comprise desirable changes in the law, it would be a very great mistake to continue the system of consolidation. He hoped the House would not accept the Amendment, as it would be very unsatisfactory if all the labour of the Joint Committee were to be thrown away.

Mr. W. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Harrow) said that, as a member of the Joint Committee since its commencement, and one of those most regular in their attendance, he thought it only right to say that he had never observed the slightest pretension or desire on the part of the Committee to alter the law. He could assure the House that they had been most jealous on every occasion to adhere to the rule that there should be no Amendment of the law. Such alterations as were involved in the piecing of one set of words to another were, of course, absolutely necessary. The observations which had been quoted from the Lord Chancellor were made with reference to an Amendment that was upon the Paper of that House, and did not propose to point out that the Bill had gone beyond the lines of mere consolidation. When an Amendment to a Bill had been made—he recollected one such case—the special attention of the House had been called to it by the Report of the Joint Committee. He urged that the work of consolidation should not be mixed up with new reforms which might be desired.

Sir C. CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton) denied that the Bill would deprive newspapers of their existing statutory privileges. These they derived under the Act of 1870, and he did not find this among the statutes repealed in the schedule. It appeared to him that the proposal with regard to registration was to secure that a registered newspaper should be deemed to be a newspaper for the purpose of any arrangement between the British Government and the Government of any British possession with regard to the contents. The effect of the Bill would be to define newspapers for international and colonial purposes.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) said that Ireland had been greatly neglected in regard to the consolidation of the statutes applying to it, and he therefore appreciated all the more what the Government proposed to do in reference to Ireland. At the commencement of the Session the English Law Officers seemed anxious to improve the law by consolidating a series of Acts and enabling them to be more accessible. He appealed to the Attorney General for Ireland to take similar steps with regard to Irish statutes, but failed to induce him to do so. Chief Baron Palles, one of the greatest Judges in the United Kingdom, recently had before him an important question arising out of the Irish Poor Law. In his judgment he said he had had to consider a long tangle of statutes which ought to have been consolidated years ago, but, as they were Irish statutes, they seemed to be thought good enough for Ireland, and it was no one's business to set them right. Ireland only got the benefit of the consolidation of the law when the work was undertaken for the whole of the United Kingdom. As to separate consolidation of Irish statutes, there seemed to be little prospect of anything being done. With great respect to the hon. Member for Lynn Regis, Departmental Acts like Post Office Acts were the very class of Acts which most needed consolidation. Statutes of practical every-day importance, to which constant reference was made, and which lawyers had at their fingers' ends, did not need consolidation so much, and the absence of consolidation in respect to these was not felt so much. The Bill did not go far enough, but, as far as it went, it served a useful purpose. He agreed that where the principle of the law was altered, it should be done by statutory enactment. But a long series of statutes was bound to contain many absurdities and anomalies. There was no reason why these should be preserved and perpetuated, and it was right that they should, if possible, be eliminated.

The defining of what a newspaper really was should be left in the hands of sensible officials. It appeared that newspapers, registered as such, prior to 1859 had privileges which newspapers registered since had not. The Post Office at Cork had refused to accept as newspapers certain newspapers in that part of Ireland which issued literary supplements. At last, after many communications between the proprietors and the Postal officials, the word "supplement" was abandoned, and—hey, presto!—the Postmaster General accepted it. If any large change in the law were made, it should be done by the House as a whole, but he contended that those who carried out the consolidation of statutes were entitled to make alterations in detail and remove absurdities and anomalies.

*THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) agreed with the hon. Member for Cork as to the importance of the consolidation of the law being carried out, and hoped he might join in the appeal to the hon. Member for Lynn Regis not to press his Motion. ["Hear, hear!"] The question before the House was far more important than any which related to this particular Measure, for it really was a question of whether the House should elect to adopt a course of procedure which would absolutely put an end to the useful work of the consolidation of the statute law of England. He admitted that every hon. Member had a right to criticise any Bill that came before the House, but at the same time he thought the common sense of the whole House would recognise that if such a right were to be exercised to the extreme limit, and every Consolidation Bill were to be submitted to minute criticism, they might give up the attempt altogether to consolidate the law of England. ["Hear, hear!"] The consolidation of statutes required that careful attention should be paid to the language. It was work which could only be done round a table, and it was preposterous to suppose that in a Committee of that House work of that kind could be done which could, however, safely enough be intrusted to a Committee whose duty it was not to alter the law, but to consolidate and avoid any substantial alteration of the law, and put the enactments which at present existed in such a form that they would be of some practical use to any lawyer not familiar with the work of the Department who had occasion to deal with the subject-matter. ["Hear, hear!"] There was one portion of the speech of the hon. Member for Lynn Regis which he really must notice. The hon. Member said that Consolidation Bills were introduced from time to time for the purpose of carrying out series of changes which the Department thought desirable. That was a statement to which he must give the most emphatic contradiction, and he thought that in making it the hon. Member must have been insensibly under the bias of the series of controversies he had with the Post Office in past days, in which, according to his own account, he was always right and the Post Office always wrong. [*Laughter.*] The hon. Member said it was not a Consolidation Bill because it did not consolidate everything. Could anything be more absurd? They must proceed by degrees in consolidation. The Bill dealt with 20 Acts relating to the Post Office, and put them in a form which would be useful to all who had occasion to inform themselves with regard to the law on these matters. Extreme care had been exercised in regard to the Bill to insure that there should be no alteration of the law, which had been left substantially as it was before. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for South Islington seconded the Motion, but at the same time said he was keenly alive to the importance of consolidation, and should deeply regret that the House should commit itself to any course of action which would prevent the passage of Consolidation Acts. But the hon. Member must feel that if such a Motion as this were accepted by the House, the death-blow would be dealt to consolidation. The hon. Member for Islington suggested that they should have consolidation in the sense of reproducing the Acts as they were, treating them consecutively. Would not consolidation such as that be mere waste-paper? There would be a series of confused and fragmentary enactments, one after another, and the public would have to pick out from that heterogeneous mass what the law was. The consolidation which the public and lawyers who were not specialists desired was consolidation which put together enactments in a shape which could be read and comprehended by anyone not familiar with all the technicalities. ["Hear, hear!"] Again, the hon. Member for Devonshire said that extensive alterations ought to be made in the Bill, and that the House ought to embark on the consideration of the whole subject of the Lands Clauses Acts and the power of acquiring land for Government and public bodies. He asked the hon. Member whether he did not think the last branch of the inquiry would seal the death-warrant to any such measures of consolidation? The Bill might as well be thrown out on the Second Reading as exposed to the fire of such Amendments and such vital alterations as the hon. Member for Devonshire suggested. The Statute Law Revision Committee in these matters of consolidation was careful to avoid any alteration in the law, but it was no use reprinting old statutes exactly as they stood. Language in the year 1830 had not the same meaning as in 1897. The circumstances had changed, and they must adapt the language of their consolidation to the circumstances with which they were dealing. The Committee having charge of this consolidation had taken a great deal of trouble to avoid any substantial alteration in the law while putting together the enactments in such a shape as to be of practical use. He hoped the House would pass the Second Reading of the Measure, and not allow the useful work of statute law consolidation to be interfered with. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES, having made his protest, asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time, and committed for Thursday.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

*The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE (Mr. Walter Long, Liverpool, West Derby), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, explained that it proposed to remove two difficulties which had arisen since the compromise on this subject in 1886. Part of that compromise was to the effect that, whereas extraordinary tithe rent-charge would only have been charged on that portion of the farm subject to extraordinary cultivation, the future tithe rent-charge should be fixed at a sum then arranged, and should apply to the whole, and not merely to part of the farm. Unfortunately, by a case which had been recently heard, that compromise had been upset, and so a part of the compromise—and a very important part from the title-owners' point of view—had not been effective. The other small change the Bill sought to make had regard to sales. When a property came for division in consequence of a sale, the Board of Agriculture had no power to apportion extraordinary tithe rent-charge as it had to apportion ordinary charge. The Bill sought to remove the injustice in the one case, and to give the Board of Agriculture the same power in the second case as they had in regard to ordinary tithe.

Bill read a Second time, and committed for Thursday.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS (HOLIDAYS) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the Third time, and passed.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

EXPLANATION OF 26 AND 27 VICT. C. 65, SS. 24, 27.

For removing doubts, it is hereby declared that the power under section twenty-four of the Volunteer Act 1863, to make rules with respect to a Volunteer Corps shall extend, and be deemed to have always extended, to rules for securing the efficiency of the members of the Corps, and that a fine for the breach of any rule made under that power shall not be deemed to be a civil debt.

MR. PICKERSGILL moved to add to the Clause the following words:—

> "Provided that, notwithstanding anything contained in section fifty-two of the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1879, the provisions of section four of the said Act respecting the mitigation of penalties by the court, and that the corresponding provisions of section six of the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Act 1881, notwithstanding anything contained in the last-named section, shall respectively apply to proceedings taken under this Act."

The hon. Member stated that his object was simply to bring the Bill into conformity with the general law. If this Bill passed as it stood the power of mitigating penalties would be taken away with regard to such offences as the Bill dealt with. It was very much worse when this power was given to Voluntary Associations such as Volunteer Corps. He ventured to make an appeal to the Attorney General. He hoped he would preserve his independent judgment, which he feared was somewhat overborne by the War Office. He sometimes feared that that House had not that regard for personal liberty which had distinguished it in times past. He was a warm advocate of the Volunteer Service, but if they passed this offensive enactment they would not be doing it any advantage or increasing its popularity. For these reasons he begged to move his Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight) said if the hon. and learned Member had an opportunity of ascertaining the facts in connection with the Act of 1879 he would see that it was not possible for him to advise the House to accept this Amendment. The hon. Member spoke of the Bill as an oppressive Bill, and said they should not have such a power in it. He thought the hon. and learned Member took a somewhat exaggerated view. What was here provided had been in force since 1863 and had worked well. It was found, however, that the existing Acts were not sufficient to carry out the object aimed at, and the Bill was simply a Measure to put the law into the condition which everyone believed it was in since 1863. Not a single word had been said to show that the law had worked unfairly or that any injustice had been done. He must ask the House not to accept the Amendment.

MR. PICKERSGILL thought this was an extremely important matter, and said he must press the Amendment to a Division.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 93; Noes, 201.—(Division List, No. 202.)

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2,—

SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the Volunteer Act 1897.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

MR. PICKERSGILL moved the insertion of the following new Clause:—

TERMINATION OF IMPRISONMENT.

If, before the expiration of the term of such imprisonment, such a proportion of the fine be paid that the term of imprisonment suffered is not less than proportional to the part of the fine still unpaid, the imprisonment shall terminate.

Clause Read a First time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL accepted the clause, which was Read a Second time, and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported, as amended; to be considered to-morrow.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—

APPEAL IN CASES STATED IN CIVIL MATTERS.

The jurisdiction and power to hear and determine appeals conferred by section twenty-four of the Judicature Act (Ireland) 1877, is hereby extended and shall apply to any Order or decision made by the High Court in Ireland or any Judge thereof, under any of the enactments set out in the schedule to this Act, anything in any of the said enactments to the contrary notwithstanding.

MR. MAURICE HEALY moved, after the word "made," to insert the words, "after the passing of the Act." He said the Bill affected procedure only, and as it now stood it would operate retrospectively, which he was sure was not the intention of the Government. The decision of the Court of Queen's Bench was final, but unless his Amendment were accepted, every decision given by the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Exchequer on a case stated in the past twelve months could be appealed against.

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. JOHN ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) accepted the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to;

Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2,—

SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act 1897, and may be cited with the Judicature (Ireland) Acts 1877 to 1888.

On the Question "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill,"

MR. MAURICE HEALY pointed out that there was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University (Mr. Carson)—[To move the following Clause,—

The persons upon whose recommendation the Lord Lieutenant may make, alter, or annul rules, pursuant to section sixty-one of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act 1877, shall include the President of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland for the time being, and shall also include two persons (one of whom shall be a practising barrister) to be appointed for the purpose by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland from time to time in writing under his hand, such appointment to continue for such time as shall be specified therein.]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said he passed the Amendment over because it was out of order.

MR. MAURICE HEALY said the title of the Bill was drawn apparently to exclude an Amendment of this kind. But if this were a Bill to amend the Irish Judicature Acts, as it purported to be by the short title, he submitted that the Amendment of the Member for Dublin University, being merely a proposal to amend the Judicature Acts, would be in order.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said he had considered the matter very carefully. If the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University had been confined to the cases dealt with in the Bill, it would have been in order. But it went very much beyond that, and therefore it went beyond the scope of the Bill. The title was not the only guide to what was in the Bill, but the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University went beyond the subject-matter of the Bill, and therefore it was not in order.

MR. MAURICE HEALY asked whether, at a later stage, it would be open to the Attorney General for Ireland to admit the principle which was advocated by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, and to get this principle into the Bill.

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND said he entirely approved of the principle embodied in the Amendment, and should have been glad to accept it if it had been in order. If the opportunity arose on a subsequent occasion, on which such an Amendment would be in order, he would be happy to consider it.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On the question "That the Bill, as amended, be reported to the House,"

MR. MAURICE HEALY asked the Attorney General whether, between this stage and Report, he would consider the advisability of allowing the appeal granted by this Bill to be taken direct to the Court of Appeal instead of to the Court of First Instance. The effect of multiplying these appeals was really to increase the cost of litigation.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: That Question hardly arises on the question that I Report this Bill to the House.

Bill Reported, as amended; to be considered upon Thursday.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Thursday.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time."—Debate arising;

And it being Ten minutes to Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

Sitting suspended at Ten minutes to Seven of the clock.

EVENING SITTING.

Sitting resumed at Nine o'clock.

SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) rose to call attention to the duration of speeches in Parliament, and to move:—

> "That the duration of speeches in this House has increased, is increasing, and should be abated."

He said that he rose with diffidence to move this Resolution, because he was aware that it was not for a humble agricultural Member of a dozen years' standing in the House to suggest a change in the procedure of the House which had lasted for two centuries. He reminded the House that he and some hon. Friends had introduced a Bill having for its object the shortening of the duration of speeches in Parliament. He admitted that the Measure was crude, yet on a division he obtained a majority of 70 in favour of it. He thought that the majority of hon. Members, however conservative their views, would not deny that there was some necessity for a modification of the rules of procedure under which the Debates were carried on. Some hon. Members might remember a Debate, 14 years ago, when an hon. Gentleman spoke from noon until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. [*Laughter.*] Last Session a right hon. Gentleman spoke on one occasion for three hours and ten minutes, and hon. Members who were Irish landlords and connected with Ulster constituencies were not likely to forget either the speech or its results. In the Financial Relations Debate the other day an hon. Gentleman, known in two continents, made a speech which lasted for two hours and ten minutes, or, rather, he read a speech of that duration. [*Laughter.*] Then there were right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who never thought of speaking under an hour. [*Laughter, and cries of* "Name!"] They also knew hon. Members who made it their boast and pride that they never rose to address the House under 40 minutes. Such was the exuberance of dialectical ability in the last Parliament, that one hon. Member spoke on a sub-head (B) of the Estimates for half an hour on every Estimate, or whenever Supply was taken. That hon. Member was a *lusus naturæ*, and the House was not likely to see many like him again. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen had said to him, "Why is it you cannot leave the rules of procedure alone? What was good enough for our predecessors is good enough for us." That was rather a specious argument, but it admitted of a straight answer. There was a Latin or Greek poet—he was brought up at Eton, but his education had been neglected—[*laughter*]—who said, "Times change, and we change with them." He recalled to the recollection of the House that in earlier years some names continually recurred in Debate like recurring decimals. The majority of hon. Members in those days sat and listened, waiting, as the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire had said, their apotheosis, or translation to the House of Lords. [*Laughter.*] These Gentlemen did not speak, and the less they spoke the sooner they got their promotion. [*Laughter.*] Their descendants at the present time sat in the House of Lords, and they attended the sittings of that Assembly as infrequently and spoke as seldom as their fathers did in the House of Commons. But this was not the way in which the business of the House of Commons was conducted at the present time. Hon. Members had to attend, and to make speeches on behalf of their constituents, and to introduce Bills whether they liked them or not. He himself once introduced a Bill for the compulsory marking of shrimps—[*laughter*]—in obedience to the orders of his constituents, and he was bound to say that the Bill did not take its place on the statute-book. [*Laughter.*] There were several precedents for imposing a time limit on speeches. There was a reference in *The Times* the other day to what happened 50 years ago, when Lord John Russell proposed a Motion, to which Mr. Milner Gibson moved an Amendment, allowing hon. Members to speak only for an hour, though Mr. Milner Gibson said that he preferred 40 minutes. Two distinguished Members of the House who voted with Mr. Milner Gibson were Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, and the Amendment was only lost by 26 votes in a moderately full House. Then in the House of Representatives at Washington the time limit, which was very short, was strictly carried out; it was only five minutes. [*Cheers and laughter.*] In the House of Convocation, in the United Service Institution, in the Poor Law Conference, the time limit was strictly enforced. If hon. Gentlemen read Gibbon they would find that 2,000 years ago in Rome, in the days of Julius Cæsar—[*laughter*]—the Emperor was said to have been much annoyed at the exuberant verbosity of certain senators, and he ordered these senators to be imprisoned. [*Laughter, and* "Hear, hear!"] The majority of the Senate, however, did not wish to see members of their body shut in the Clock Tower, and, afterwards, according to the historian, such was the flow of eloquence that decent debate was subsequently impossible. In moving this Resolution he did not address his remarks to the Front Benches. When right hon. Gentlemen chose they spoke as long as they liked, and as long as the House lasted this would always be so. He addressed himself rather to the private Member who was shut out of debate by the prolixity of right hon. Gentlemen. The Debate on the Financial Relations, for example, lasted three days; but scores of Members did not enjoy the chance of speaking. Then there was an agricultural Debate on a Motion made by the hon. Member for St. Helens. He did not think that was likely to bring about a millennium in the rural districts, and he should have liked to say so, but it was impossible—the whole time was gone and the Debate was over. Although he and his Friends had taken particular care not to put any time limit in the Resolution, his own idea was that if right hon. Gentlemen could not liberate their soul in an hour, and if private Members could not say all they had to say in 15 minutes, then they did not know their trade and were not fit to occupy a seat in this House. [*Laughter and cheers.*] He and his Friends had not canvassed or button-holed any Members in the Lobby to support this Resolution; they had agreed to run the Resolution on its own merits, in the sporting phraseology which Lord Salisbury had adopted. If the right hon. Gentlemen would support the Resolution they would be received by their countrymen, when they went down in the autumn to address them, with more gratitude than if they had brought in half-a-dozen Education Bills—[*laughter*]—and private Members would be received by their constituents in the words of "Alice in Wonderland:"—

> "And hast thou slain the Jabberwock?
> Come to my arms, my beamish boy."

[*Laughter.*]

Mr. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Hereford), in seconding the Motion, said no innovation either in principle or in practice was advocated. Those who had been long in Parliament had witnessed many changes all tending to the limitation of Debate. He need only refer to the different varieties of the Closure which in the last ten years had sprung into being, the reduction in the number of stages through which a Measure had to pass. In the Debates of 1849 Mr. Hume mentioned that in his day an hon. Member had 17 opportunities during the course of a Measure of speaking upon it; now the opportunities were reduced to about eight. The evil now lay not so much in the length of speeches as the frequency of some speakers in addressing the House—[*laughter*]—and the fact that they frequently repeated their own arguments and, perhaps, more frequently repeated the arguments of other Members. Private Members were not entirely to blame for the desultory character of the speeches. From the mode in which business was arranged, from the uncertainty which attaches to the time or the opportunity on which any given subject might actually come on for Debate, it was scarcely worth the while of any private Member who had anything else to do to get up the subject thoroughly, because he never knew whether he would be able to deliver his sentiments, whether the time would serve, whether the Debate would come on, or whether he would be able to catch Mr. Speaker's eye as it revolves in its orbit. [*Laughter.*] As was observed by the eminent Statesman who took part in the discussion of 1849, "it was the uninformed themselves who had not thoroughly considered the subject who make the long speeches." ["Hear, hear!"] It had been calculated that, taking the ordinary duration of the Parliamentary Session and making allowance for holidays, counts-out, and so forth, the House spent in actual Debate something like 1,000 or 1,100 hours. Take it at 1,050. They might allot to the occupants of the Treasury Bench 300 hours and to Members of the Front Opposition Bench 150; that would leave 600 hours to ordinary Members, or, say, an hour a-piece. But they all knew that the bulk of hon. Members were not habitual speakers, and that the delays and redundancies and repetitions were inflicted upon the House by the comparatively few. ["Hear, hear!"] There were about 100 Members who were the regular speakers in the House, and he suggested that to the House generally, exclusive of the Front Benches, 600 hours should be allotted in the Session. The speeches of every Member might be recorded, and when he had occupied three hours of his time the fact should be intimated to him. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] Members of the Government could divide the time placed at their disposal among themselves; and if anyone wished for an extension of his time, he could borrow it from a colleague. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He begged to second the Resolution.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that he could remember the House more than 40 years ago, and he thought it was a mistake to suppose that there ever was a golden age when there were no bores, and when there were no complaints of the length of speeches. In the olden days a prolix speaker, who did not command the respect of the House, was subjected to rather rude interruptions, which were, however, employed with discretion, and never without representing the feeling of the House. In those days just as much useful work was got through, though with a great deal less speaking, for it was not thought necessary for everyone to speak, nor for everyone who had prepared a speech to deliver it. [*Cheers.*] No doubt, on account of the fierce light which now beat on the proceedings of the House, hon. Members liked their constituents to know that they were not silent; but hon. Members could, surely, exercise some restraint in not prolonging Debate by repeating arguments which had been stated by others. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not think the time had come when any drastic or automatic machinery could be adopted to regulate Debate; and it would be a great misfortune if such expedients were resorted to. The good sense of the House had hitherto been sufficient, without any precise rules, to enable the House to boast that it was the model and mother of Parliaments. The measures which had been taken within the last ten years had restored the order that obtained in times past; and the Debates were now conducted with as much regularity and decorum as he could ever remember. [" Hear, hear! "]

Sir ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead) said that there was one person of whom complaint might justly be made, and that was the expert and specialist. Such a person had a right to be heard on the subject; but everyone had read his views beforehand in the magazines or newspapers. If such Members would only condense their arguments in the same way as they did in their letters to *The Times*, the Debates would gain considerably. [" Hear, hear! "] Some curtailment was necessary to restore the interest and brightness of the Debates. A real Debate was, indeed, seldom heard nowadays. It was generally a succession of essays. [" Hear, hear! "]

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.) said that anyone who occupied a prominent position in the House, as did the right hon. Member for North-East Manchester, could always find an opportunity for taking part in Debate. But that was not the case with humbler Members, who on certain occasions ought to have more opportunity of expressing their views concisely. [" Hear, hear! "] He could not agree with the hon. Member for Hereford that there were no very recent examples of excessively long speeches. On the Third Reading of the Voluntary Schools Bill only 14 speakers were able to take part in the Debate, though it lasted the whole evening. The Financial Relations Debate occupied three days, on the first of which there were five speakers, on the second eight, and on the third only six. Yet that was a subject on which many Members felt a great interest. There were many many public bodies which had tried the experiment of limiting speeches, particularly the County Councils. On the Council with which he was connected, there was a particularly stringent rule, and the Standing Order had rarely to be suspended. The House might try the experiment, in the first place, on private Members' evenings. It might be said that public opinion would do all that was necessary; but the methods which were once effectual in hinting to a speaker that he had exhausted the patience were no longer effectual. He asked the House seriously to take into consideration this growing evil. [" Hear, hear! "]

Mr. R. G. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) thought that some of the blame for the prolixity of Members was due to the Press. If an hon. Member condensed his observations within 20 minutes—which was long enough for the statement of his case—the gentlemen of the Reporters' Gallery cut down his remarks to a two minutes' speech. [*Laughter.*] The result of that system was to encourage Members to speak at undue length. The bore who occupied the attention of the House for a long time got some at least of his remarks reported, while the Member who made a short, bright speech, without the aid of notes, was dismissed with the line: " After some observations from Mr. A. B., the House divided." [*Laughter.*]

***Mr. WALTER MORRISON** (York, W.R., Skipton) said that when he first entered the House of Commons there was a Rule against the Reading, in the course of a speech, of any printed matter except extracts from the Debates or from Reports or Papers presented to Parliament; but nowadays it was quite a common thing for Members to equip themselves with printed quotations from newspapers and read them at great length. [" Hear, hear! "] He thought that if the rule objecting to the reading of printed matter were revived, and if, in consequence, hon. Members had to write out the extracts they wished to read, the length of speeches would be considerably reduced. [*Laughter and* " Hear, hear! "] He also thought the House ought to set its face against the growing habit of reading speeches in manuscript. [" Hear, hear! "] If an unofficial Member could not condense what he had got to say into a quarter of an hour, or a right hon. Gentleman what he had got to say into an hour, he ought to go to school again. [" Hear, hear! "] He recollected that when Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli were the leading Members of the House and followed each other in Debate they usually occupied only one hour each, and in that time they were both able to state their points with admirable clearness and force.

The House divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 24.—(Division List, No. 203.)

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY (JUDICIAL DUTIES, EXPENSE).

*Mr. CHARLES HARRISON (Ply- hoped the House would agree that the

> "That this House is of opinion that a portion of the expenses incurred by the Incorporated Law Society in fulfilling the duties imposed upon it by the Statute 51 and 52 Vic. c. 65, should be defrayed out of public funds."

He said the Motion was in principle adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year, but exception was taken on that occasion to the particular form in which the Resolution was moved. He hoped the House would agree that the grant should be made out of public funds without any interception. Solitors on being articled paid stamp duty, they paid duty on admission, and they paid a duty for the purpose of being at liberty to practise their profession; and the funds thus contributed to the public Exchequer amounted to no less than from £180,000 to £190,000 a year. It was not necessary for the professional solicitor to belong to any society, and he could not be expelled from the profession merely because the Law Society so desired. In former years the Rolls Court exercised jurisdiction, and cases of complaint were investigated by the Master of the Rolls, which resulted in great delays. In 1888 a reform took place, and the judicial duty of investigation was imposed upon the Incorporated Law Society, whose Reports were acted upon. He believed about a thousand cases had been investigated, and large payments had been made in the performance of this statutory judicial duty. The Reports and the work which had been done had been most highly spoken of by the present Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and the Master of the Rolls. The Lord Chancellor had written to the President of the Society, in which he stated the functions of the Society appeared to him "both valuable and well performed;" and he recognised that they do a public service and save time and expense in the Courts which have jurisdiction in the matters of solicitors. As this judicial work involved considerable expense it was just that it should be paid out of public funds instead of being paid out of the voluntary subscriptions of this society. He begged to move the Motion. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. W. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Harrow) seconded the Motion. He was satisfied that it was founded upon justice and policy. ["Hear, hear!"] This was not an act of "trade unionism;" what they asked for was not for the benefit of solicitors, but entirely in the interest of the public. It was found that no one could do this work so well as the Law Society, and so long as they gave their services for nothing, as was the case at present, it was only just that the expense involved in these investigations, which he believed amounted to about £5,000 a year, should be provided by the State.

Mr. THOMAS BUCKNILL (Surrey, Epsom) said he had the permission of the Lord Chancellor to say that he agreed fully with the spirit of the Motion. That was a high authority to start with. The matter should meet with the sympathy of the House, if for no other reason for this—that, instead of the old-fashioned, dilatory process of proceeding in the first instance by affidavit, then the matter being referred to a master, proceeding before the master as if he were a Judge, and considering the report of the master, the modern and excellent practice had been created by statute of a committee of the Incorporated Law Society considering each case brought before them, and, if they thought fit, making a report of it to the Court of Queen's Bench. A great saving of time and expense had been effected by the machinery provided by the Act of 1888. When the subject was last before the House the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed himself favourable to the consideration of the matter. It had been said that, if solicitors chose to consider the ways of peccant members of that branch of the legal profession, they should be glad to do it within closed doors at their own expense. But this was not true. The Statutory Committee considered whether on the facts brought before them the matter should go further or not, and they often paid the costs on one side or the other out of their own pocket. When the report of the Incorporated Law Society came before the Divisional Court of Queen's Bench the Judges had to say whether the report of the Incorporated Law Society was to be upheld or reversed. Everything showed that the present machinery for dealing with the matter was excellent. If it were so, why should the Incorporated Law Society be called upon to pay the expense out of their own pocket? If it led to a saving of public time and expense, ought not the Society to be reimbursed? He heartily supported the Motion.

*MR. MELLOR (York, W.R., Sowerby) said this was really a matter of simple justice. Not a large sum was asked for, and it was merely to reimburse the Incorporated Law Society for the expense they went to in discharge of a public duty. This had been extremely well performed since 1888, and it was a duty of great importance to the public. It was very much to the advantage of the public that complaints against solicitors should be inquired into by a body of gentlemen well qualified and of experience in that branch of the profession, who had command of all the necessary machinery. The Lord Chief Justice spoke not only for himself, but for the Judges of the Queen's Bench Division, in favour of the proposal, and the Master of the Rolls and the Lord Chancellor also concurred. If these great authorities found the work of the committee of the Incorporated Law Society so valuable, surely the public ought not to allow them to be out of pocket, considering the hard work they undertook in the service of the public.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES held that when a proposal was made to tax the country to get solicitors struck off the rolls it should be made by a Minister of the Crown in Committee of the whole House. When the matter was before the House in July last the Leader of the Opposition said the Incorporated Law Society kept the rolls clean for their own sake, and had no more right to be paid for keeping them clean than an Inn of Court had to be paid for disbarring a barrister. He himself submitted that there was no ground for this demand to give £4,500 a year to a very respectable trade union. He believed the Incorporated Law Society was put to no expense at all. It had been said that until 1888 the duty of investigating complaints against solicitors was performed by the Court. If a man were to be driven out of his profession it should be by the Court. [HON. MEMBERS: "So it is."] The examination of the solicitor was no longer conducted in Court, but in private by a private society. All that came before the Court was the report of the society. The late Lord Bramwell, speaking on this subject, said the proper way to deal with a solicitor's professional conduct was in open Court, not in the secret chamber of any society, however respectable. ["Hear, hear!"] What he wanted to point out to the House was this. It was said that a duty was imposed upon the Society by the Act of 1888. He did not think that was a fair statement of the case. What was done by the Act of 1888 was to give this Society all the powers and privileges which they themselves had asked for. The only duty imposed upon them was, when they had held their inquiry, and come to their conclusion, that of presenting their report to the Court. There was nothing expensive about that. A sheet of foolscap paper and five minutes' time would suffice to make the copy that was presented to the Court. His belief was that no expense at all had been incurred by this Act. The Bill was introduced in the Autumn Session of 1888, and became law on the 25th December of that year. In the Report of the Incorporated Law Society of the preceding July, Sir Henry Watson Parker reported that—

> "the Council were of opinion that it would be to the interest of the profession that such powers should be sought for. The present process for punishing delinquent solicitors is complicated, involves unnecessary expense and a waste of energy, and the functions now exercised by the Court, at a considerable cost to the Society, can be well exercised by the Council alone."

It was upon the ground of economy alone that the Society demanded the extension to them of the powers which were formerly exercised by the Court. In the next Report, after the Act was passed, they proceeded to say that it was the opinion of the Committee that in ordinary circumstances a fee not exceeding three guineas should be sufficient to cover all professional charges of preparing and lodging the complaint, and providing the affidavit in support of it. The House would be gratified to learn that since the passing of the Act an average of only fourteen solicitors per annum had been struck off the roll. That would come to a matter of 42 guineas per annum, according to the estimate made in 1889 by the Incorporated Law Society themselves. They said that a fee of three guineas would suffice, therefore it was not £5,000 a year they should ask for, but £42 a year. But his belief was that it did not cost them even that. He found that the law expenses of the Incorporated Law Society in the year 1888, immediately before the passing of the Act, were £4,046, but in 1896 their law and Parliamentary expenses, including the cost of the Committee under the Solicitors' Act, 1888, were not £4,046, but only £3,767. It seemed to him, therefore, that the expenses had been absolutely less in the last year than they were in the last year before the Solicitors' Act was passed, and that, instead of this matter costing the Society more, it had cost them absolutely less. He did not, therefore, know upon what kind of ground this claim could be made. He admitted that when solicitors ran away with clients' money, or otherwise misbehaved themselves, it was the duty of this extremely respectable trades union to see that such delinquents were struck off the rolls, but he believed the method of examination enshrined in this Act was an unfortunate one. The right hon. Member for Wolverhampton thought so at one time, because he found, on reference to the history of the Bill, that when it was introduced the right hon. Gentleman announced that he should strongly object to a good many of its clauses.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): And the Bill was altered.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES found no verbal record of the alterations in "Hansard." At any rate, it was not, in his opinion, altered sufficiently, and he only regretted that he was not earlier a Member of that Parliament, in which case, perhaps, he might have had a voice in the matter himself. He trusted it would not be thought he was an enemy of the honourable profession of solicitors, but he did not think, in the first place, on public grounds, that any private body whatever, for any purpose whatever, should receive a permanent charge of £5,000 from the taxpayers of this country. In the second place, he asserted that it had not in the least been made out that any case existed of extra expense having been incurred by this Society in consequence of the duties (as they were called) cast upon them by this Act; and, in the third place, he denied that any duties of an onerous nature had been cast upon them by the Act. The only duty was a duty of presenting a report, and all the rest the Act did was to give the Society privileges, advantages, and powers, which, he thought, it would have been much better not to have given, and which, when the Society asked for, they said not a word about their being likely to cause extra expense. On the contrary, the Report he had quoted showed that the suggestion was that, if this power were given to the Society, no extra expense would be incurred, but the cost would be less, and that was the one great ground put forward in the Report of the Society. In these circumstances, it did not lie in the mouth of the Society now to come and ask for public money on this ground. This was an academic discussion, for, whatever the result of the Resolution might be, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not going to part with £5,000 except much better reasons could be given than had been adduced in the House that night.

*SIR EDWARD CLARKE (Plymouth) said so far as he was concerned as a Member of the Bar, it was a matter of absolute indifference whether the Motion was carried or not. His only interest was in seeing the discharge by a competent body of a serious and important public duty, and that was an interest common to all. But having had opportunities of judging of the value of this work, he would not be deterred by the sarcasm of the hon. Member for King's Lynn from saying a word about the matter. By the Act of 1888 an important public duty was transferred to the Committee of the Incorporated Law Society. Before that date it was necessary, in order that there should be an investigation into the conduct of a solicitor, that there should be a formal application to a court of law; and a great many persons who thought they had ground of complaint were unwilling to take what seemed to them the dangerous and expensive course of making such an application. For that procedure had been substituted simply the necessity of a communication, almost an informal communication, to the Incorporated Law Society. Directly that communication was received a committee consisting of some of the most experienced and most trustworthy solicitors in this country, investigated the complaint. If they found that there was no *prima facie* reason for instituting proceedings against the solicitor they dismissed the case; if they found that there was a *prima facie* case, they thereupon proceeded to procure a full investigation. Before 1888 the expenses of these proceedings were in great measure borne by the State. Now, instead of being conducted by a Master of the Queen's Bench paid out of the public funds, it was conducted by a committee of solicitors belonging to the Incorporated Law Society, who received no payment whatever for discharging duties which involved great sacrifices of their own time. Surely it was unreasonable, when Parliament had agreed to the scheme which set up this tribunal, and when, after nine years' experience, that tribunal was found to be far more effective and useful than the tribunal which existed before, to say to the solicitors: "You shall, in your certificate, duly pay to the State a sum of £180,000 a year. We have put upon you the discharge of an important public duty. That public duty being properly discharged by you, costs you a good deal of money, and we will not even make a rebate from the contribution which you make to the State in order to pay the expenses of your investigations." The Law Society stated deliberately that the expenses of the investigations amounted to an average of nearly £5,000 a year. That being so it seemed to him a matter of elementary justice that they should be allowed such an abatement for the contribution that they made to the public funds as might compensate them for the expense they incurred in the discharge of a public duty. [*Cheers.*] He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give an assurance upon the matter. If he did he would secure the permanent, the effective, and the satisfactory discharge of these public duties, and would be discharging a debt and not in any way conferring a boon or a gift on a trade union. [*Cheers.*]

SIR HENRY FOWLER said the hon. Member for Lynn Regis had an encyclopædic knowledge of matters which came before the House. But there were subjects outside his range, and one on which he was profoundly ignorant was that branch of the legal profession to which he (Sir H. Fowler) had the honour to belong, and the working of the Incorporated Law Society. The hon. Member had referred to the part which he (the speaker) took in connection with the Act of 1888. The hon. Member was misinformed. He objected to the form of the Act as it was originally introduced, and he strove successfully to secure that this body, as it was to have judicial functions conferred upon it by the State, should be appointed, not by what the hon. Member, not happily, called a trade union, but by a public functionary. A clause was inserted providing that the power of appointment should rest exclusively with the Master of the Rolls, and that their procedure should be regulated by rules to be drawn up and approved of by the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, and the Master of the Rolls. His view was that, if this Committee was to have judicial duties intrusted to it, the Committee ought to be appointed by an independent body of the highest ability and competence. He did not suppose that the Law Society had any idea at the time of what ultimately the quantum of this procedure would be; but the work had been very well done. Only the other day, in a case that came before the Court of Appeal, the Master of the Rolls alluded in the strongest terms to the great assistance rendered to him and the Court by the careful and judicial investigation into the facts of the case by this Committee. Since 1888 nearly 1,000 cases had been investigated by it. The members of the Committee, whose time was emphatically their money, sat day by day during a long period of the year; they received no remuneration whatever, and the expenses which they asked the State to defray were payments to third persons. The amount of these payments averaged about £5,000 a year. A poor man robbed by a defaulting solicitor often had no means with which to institute a prosecution in Chancery proceedings, and, of course, anyone who was appointed to act for him had to be paid. The costs which the Incorporated Law Society paid to other people were solicitors' and counsel's fees. The Law Society were quite willing to discharge the duties intrusted to them, but they were not willing to tax themselves pecuniarily to the amount of £4,000 or £5,000 annually. That they should be expected to do so was not fair, for they were protecting the interests of the public and the State. The Judges, by the way in which they had treated the Committee's reports, had shown that they were perfectly satisfied. The statement that the Committee's proceedings were costing £4,000 or £5,000 a year was not made haphazard. The figures had been verified before the Treasury officials and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was a very careful guardian of the public purse, and not a man at all likely to listen to a sentimental or imaginary grievance. For his part, he was quite willing as a Member of that House to leave it to the right hon. Gentleman to determine what was the proper sum to pay to the Incorporated Law Society. The facts were very simple. Here was a body appointed by Parliament to discharge judicial duties entailing very heavy expenditure. Those duties had been performed to the satisfaction of the authorities and the public, and surely it was not reasonable that men who devoted their time, ability, and attention to these matters should also be called upon to defray the cost of investigations and proceedings out of their own pockets. ["Hear, hear!"]

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said that he was not prepared to agree to expenditure simply because it was recommended by even such great personages as the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and the Master of the Rolls. Those legal luminaries did not always agree, and although they did agree on this subject, it was not on account of such agreement that he would be disposed to sanction this expenditure. Nor did he think that any society regulating any profession or trade for the advantage of its members, and also for the advantage of the public, was necessarily entitled to claim a grant from that House. But the Incorporated Law Society was in a peculiar position, because the profession of a solicitor was one in which it was necessary for laymen like himself to have implicit confidence, and if that confidence was misplaced and fraud was committed, it often happened that the client was too poor to obtain any remedy himself or to take action to protect the public against similar frauds in the future. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore, to a certain extent the Incorporated Law Society and the solicitors' profession did stand in a different position from that of most other professions or trades. This subject was brought before him last year, and he investigated it very carefully, and the result was that he felt himself justified in making a proposal to Parliament in the sense of the Motion now before the House. That proposal, however, was not accepted. It was opposed mainly on the ground that there would be an interception of a tax before the tax reached the Exchequer. He was not, however, acting without precedent, for under an Act passed not long ago the King's Inns in Dublin had received similar assistance for certain necessary work done with regard to the profession of the Bar in Ireland, and in making his proposal he had but imitated what Parliament had done in their behalf. He, however, felt the force of the objection, and did not press his proposal. The hon. Member for Plymouth had brought the matter forward again that evening with the object of obtaining from the House an acceptance of the view that in some way or other the assistance which was desired by the Incorporated Law Society should be given by Parliament. That was a matter which he would like to leave to the House. There was one point which appeared to him to differentiate this case from almost any other that could arise, and that was, that there was a special tax on the profession of solicitors—["hear, hear!"]—and that, as the profession was specially taxed, undoubtedly there might be a claim from it which could hardly arise from any other profession, that a portion, and not a large portion, of that tax should be allowed, so to speak, by Parliament to the Incorporated Law Society for performing statutory duties which everyone admitted were well performed, not only to the advantage of the profession itself, but also of the public. ["Hear, hear!"] He could only say that if it should be the pleasure of the House to affirm this Resolution, he should think it his duty to act upon it by submitting to the House a Vote for such a sum as, on investigation, might seem to him to be right. ["Hear, hear!"] He owned that he felt that it was placing this society perhaps in a somewhat invidious position; but at the same time it would unquestionably be a payment, not for any work they did for themselves, but for the necessary expenses they incurred in the performance of a public duty; and he did not think it would be a precedent which would be injurious to the Exchequer as forming grounds for similar claims on the part of anyone else, and therefore he was willing to leave the matter in the hands of the House. ["Hear, hear!"]

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 16.—(Division List, No. 204.)

ASSISTANT COUNTY SURVEYORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 14th June.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. PERCY THORNTON (Clapham) moved, "That the Bill be now read a Second time." He explained that the Bill referred to vehicles used on country roads, and required them to carry lights during certain hours. In England bicycles were required to show lights at night, but in Ireland it was not so. Many accidents had happened and continued to occur owing to the present bye-laws being of a different character. A person might start in a county where lights were enjoined upon all carriages, and yet find that the day's journey concluded where no such rule was in existence. The agricultural interest objected to having to provide these necessary lamps, and urged that they would involve a tax upon an already overburdened industry.

AN HON. MEMBER called attention to the fact that there were not 40 Members present.

*MR. SPEAKER: There are 40 Members present.

*MR. THORNTON, resuming, urged that the purchase and the carrying of a lamp were not very expensive matters. The promoters of the Measure were prepared to meet any objection in a fair and comprehensive spirit. They did not propose to stand by every word, but were willing that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee so that its provisions might be carefully scrutinised.

MR. ARTHUR JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke) pointed out that a county council had power to make bye-laws requiring vehicles passing along roads at night to carry lights, and that many councils had already made such bye-laws, and very oppressive to agriculturists they had proved to be. It was absurd to suppose that carts or waggons going at a walking pace promoted collisions, and if his hon. Friend intended to persevere with the Measure he trusted that the hon. Gentleman would consent to the introduction of an Amendment exempting such vehicles from the necessity to carry lights. In Hampshire the County Council had passed a bye-law requiring all vehicles except those used for agricultural purposes and those going at a walking pace to carry lights. If the hon. Member for Clapham would agree to such an Amendment no harm could be done. The Bill as it stood had been considered by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and the resolution was unanimously arrived at that the Measure would be very oppressive to agriculturists unless some Amendment of the kind he had described were inserted.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (York, N.R., Thirsk) said that the Yorkshire Union of Agricultural Clubs had unanimously condemned the Bill if it was intended to apply to agricultural carts going at a walking pace. It was alleged that agriculturists thought expense would be caused to farmers if they were required to light their vehicles. There was more in the Bill than that, because it must provide for the imposition of fines if it was to have any effect at all. He thought it was a pity, in the present state of agricultural depression, that this Bill, which was in the interests of those who lived in towns, should be introduced. He thought it was a perfectly unnecessary bit of legislation as regarded these particular carts and waggons, and he hoped the House would reject it.

MR. FREDERICK CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) was of opinion that the carrying of lights could only impose a small cost on anyone connected with agriculture, and he could assure hon. Members representing southern constituencies that people living near large towns, and especially those living near agricultural towns, had a great grievance in this matter. He thought all vehicles should carry lights. This would, he thought, simplify the case. A great source of danger was to be found in the milk carts which were left standing outside of a house while the milkman went to the house door. These did not carry lights, and he could assure hon. Members that if they were driving along the road when such a vehicle was left in the way, it was very difficult to prevent running into it. He thought this Bill would be of very great benefit to all members of the community.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE thought this was one of those matters in which the House should be cautious how it took out of the hands of local authorities powers which were already vested in them. There was a great difference of opinion as to the wisdom of a rule like this. It was a subject constantly under the attention of different County Councils. It was quite true that some of them had recently made a bye-law in this direction, and it was equally true that others had qualified that bye-law by some such exception as had been proposed by the hon. Member for Basingstoke. He thought, therefore, they might say that the time was not yet quite ripe for any general rule of this kind. At the present moment he thought the agricultural districts would rather be left to the tender mercies of their own County Councils, who knew the local needs and could make bye-laws when they were required, than have a rigid and unbending rule like this imposed on the country as a whole.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said that Section 7 of the Bill applied to Ireland, and under the third Section an ordinary Irish tenant farmer's cart, no matter how small, in which he conveyed his produce to market, would have to provide a light when he was returning from market. This would be a great grievance to impose on the small tenant farmers in Ireland, many of whom were so poor that they could not afford to buy cart grease for their carts, let alone oil for lamps. Legislation like this affecting Ireland was absolutely unnecessary and tyrannical. It was quite proper that bicycles should be dealt with in large cities like London, where "scorchers" rushed along the streets at the rate of 20 to 30 miles an hour, but to apply a Bill like this in the country was to carry legislation to the verge of the farcical. He, therefore, strongly opposed the Bill.

MR. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) spoke in the interests of young people who were cooped up in large towns, and who had few opportunities to escape from the smoke and the turmoil to enjoy the fresh air of the country. This Bill was not brought forward in the interests of those who could drive or ride, but in the interests of hundreds of thousands of young folks who were entitled after a hard day's work to get out of the smoke and inhale a little fresh air in the country. The opposition to this Bill came with a very bad grace from the agricultural party—[*cheers*]—after the way they had been treated in the Agricultural Rating Act. As to the interference of the Bill in Ireland, he would advise hon. Members from that country to do everything they could to encourage everybody to go there with a bicycle, because for every 6d. spent in oil and lamp thousands of pounds would be spent in the country.

*MR. H. J. WILSON (York, W.R., Holmfirth) thought the Bill was entirely unnecessary. Its provisions would be most dangerous at harvest time, when carts were loaded with highly-combustible material. It would, besides, be very inconvenient to compel farmers to have their carts lighted up with a petroleum lamp, when they had, perhaps, only 100 yards to go along a high road (after traversing half-a-mile of private road or field) to get to the farmyard. He could not see the slightest necessity for the House troubling itself with such a mischievous Bill.

MR. F. G. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said his experience in driving was that heavy carts going at a walking pace along the road were the worst offenders, because they drove on the wrong side of the road, and nearly always the drivers were asleep. The annals of coaching days were full of anecdotes illustrating this. He agreed that there would be a certain amount of hardship at harvest time, but this might be met by regulations extending the time during harvest operations. The cost of a lamp must be small, and oil was very cheap. It was not often that farmers sent carts along the road. The great offenders were the heavy vans of the brewers. The Bill could do no harm to agriculture, and might prevent many accidents.

MR. W. O. CLOUGH (Portsmouth) supported the Bill on behalf of a large number of cyclists. On the Middlesex roads, the market gardeners' carts going to Covent Garden were a constant danger, and an accident had occurred to a member of his own family on account of them.

*Mr. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) regretted that the hon. Member for Oldham had introduced into the Debate an antagonism between town and country in this question. The agricultural Members had as much sympathy with the cyclists as anyone else. He thought cyclists would agree that, considering the rough journeys farm carts had to undertake, and the inflammatory nature of many kinds of farm produce and of farm premises, often in isolated regions, the fewer unnecessary lamps and lucifer matches were called for, in connection with that industry, the better. These heavy carts went too slowly to be a danger to the traffic, and they made noise enough to be heard a mile off. It was not merely the desire to save the cost of the lamp-oil, but the desire to avoid any unnecessary duties and burdens, and to obviate the danger of fire, that led agricultural Members to ask for exemption from what might, in other respects, be a useful Bill.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.) opposed the Second Reading of the Bill, as it tended to curtail the liberties and privileges of the Irish people. It might be necessary to have lights on carts and carriages in the crowded thoroughfares of London, but in Ireland one might travel miles upon miles without meeting a single vehicle on the roads; and when one was met with it was almost certain to be a donkey's cart. Again, in England policemen were so few that if an English farmer were to neglect to light up he would escape detection; but in Ireland policemen were as thick as blackberries—they were to be met at every corner; and there was, therefore, no chance for an Irish farmer to escape if he neglected to show a light on a donkey's cart. He was sure that the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill meant no evil to Ireland. But then the hon. Gentleman knew nothing about Ireland, and he would advise him in future to leave legislation to the Irish officials, who were paid for that sort of thing, or to the Irish Members, who knew something about the country.

Mr. R. G. WEBSTER claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.—Debate resumed.

Mr. JOHN BRIGG (York, W.R., Keighley) objected to the Bill principally because it proposed to override all the local regulations of the County Councils in regard to the carrying of lights by vehicles at night. In his own district the rule was that vehicles travelling faster than a walking pace should have lights. Again, in his district the roads were well lighted. There were 25 or 30 miles of roads lighted all the way with lamps, and there was no necessity that vehicles travelling on those roads should carry lights. The local authorities would consider it a great reflection on their action if any Act passed by that House overruled them, and he objected to the Bill, therefore, on their behalf.

Question put, "That the Bill be now Read a Second time." The House divided, and Mr. Percy Thornton, one of the tellers for the Ayes, announced the result as follows:—

Ayes	40
Noes	40

The announcement of the figures was received with laughter.

*Mr. SPEAKER thereupon said: The numbers being equal, it is my duty to vote, and in accordance with the usual practice of the Chair in such circumstances, I shall give it in such a way as will afford the House another opportunity of taking a decision on this matter. I therefore give my vote with the Ayes, and declare that the Ayes have it.

The Division List—No. 205—as appended, shows—Ayes, 44; Noes, 40.

AYES.

Anstruther, H. T.
Arnold, Alfred
Ascroft, Robert
Baker, Sir John
Banbury, Frederick George
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Charrington, Spencer
Clough, Walter Owen
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Davies, Horatio D. (Chatham)
Doughty, George
Fisher, William Hayes
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone,Rt.Hon.HerbertJohn
Goldsworthy, Major General
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hedderwick, Thomas CharlesH.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kenyon, James
Leuty, Thomas Richmond
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Massey-Mainwaring,Hon. W.F.
Morton, Edward John Chalmers
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham (Bute
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.McTaggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, John G. (Oxford Univ.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Ure, Alexander
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webster, R. G. (St. Pancras)
Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.
Wills, Sir William Henry
Wilson, J. W. (Worc'sh., N.)
Wortley Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Mr. Thornton and Mr. Graham.

NOES.

Arrol, Sir William
Beach,Rt.Hon.Sir M.H.(Bristol)
Billson, Alfred
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Chaloner, Captain R. G. W.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Crilly, Daniel
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dane, Richard M.
Davies, W. Rees- (Pembrokesh.)
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Henry
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Hugh, E. (Armagh, S.)
McKillop, James
Milward, Colonel Victor
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Pryce-Jones, Edward
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Walrond, Sir William Hood
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Mr. Jeffreys and Mr. Daly.

Bill read a Second time, and committed for to-morrow.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MIDWIVES' REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 20th May.

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 21st May.

TEIND COURT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SHOPS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

House Adjourned at Two Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 12th May 1897.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Mr. **Percy Thornton** (Clapham) and Mr. **Daly** (Monaghan, S.), the Tellers for the "Ayes" in the Division yesterday on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Vehicles (Lights) Bill, came to the Table, and the former stated that he and his co-Teller, the hon. Member for Monaghan, had erroneously reported to the Speaker that the numbers voting for the "Ayes" in the Division on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Vehicles (Lights) Bill were 40, instead of 44, as appeared in the Division List.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the Tellers for the "Ayes" are agreed that there was a mistake, if the hon. Member will from his place move that the Journals of the House be corrected, I have no doubt that the House will agree to the Motion.

The hon. Members having returned to their places,

Mr. THORNTON moved that the Journals of the House be corrected accordingly. The hon. Member at the same time expressed his regret for the mistake for which he and his co-Teller were responsible. The error was the more to be regretted since it had caused Mr. Speaker to give an important ruling as to the course to be taken in case of an equality of votes, when in fact there had been no such equality.

Mr. DALY seconded the Motion, and also expressed his regret that the mistake should have occurred.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered, That the Clerk do correct the said error in the Journal of this House by stating the number of the Ayes to be 44 instead of 40.—(*Mr. Thornton.*)

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

***Mr. LECKY** (Dublin University) moved, "That the Bill be now read a Second time." He said that the Measure provided that the Sunday Closing (Ireland) Act 1878, should be made perpetual, that it should be extended to the five Irish cities which had been hitherto exempted from its operation, that public-houses should be closed on Saturdays at 9 o'clock at night, and that the *bonâ fide* traveller limit should be increased to six miles. The House was doubtless aware that Sunday closing was much more popular outside England than within it. There were several reasons for this. One was that there was a real difference of opinion between England on the one hand and Scotland, Ireland, and the Colonies. In some cases also the difference was due to the fact that it was much easier to work such legislation in a spirit-drinking than in a beer-drinking country. Beer must be drank fresh, whereas, as had been truly and wittily said, if spirits did not keep it was not the fault of the spirits. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] Sunday closing had spread through nearly every colony of the British Empire, and had fully passed into the habits of the people. It had been adopted in all parts of Scotland as early as 1854, and no one had the least intention of repealing or modifying it. It had been adopted in the whole of Wales in 1882, and a Royal Commission in 1889 had attested its success. As far as regarded Ireland, in May 1876, a Resolution in favour of entire Sunday closing for all Ireland was carried in the House of Commons against the Government of the day by a majority of 57. In the following year a Select Committee of that House reported in favour of entire Sunday closing for all Ireland. In 1878 the Irish Sunday Closing Act, which provided for entire Sunday Closing in Ireland except in the cities of Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, was passed as a tentative Measure for four years, being supported by a large majority of the Irish Members. It was soon found that it was a success. In 1880 a deputation waited upon the then Chief Secretary, Mr. Forster, to ask him, as representing the Government, to endeavour to have the Act made permanent. On that occasion Mr. Forster said:—

> "There can scarcely be any doubt that the Sunday Closing Act will be renewed by the Government that is in power. . . . As far as I can make out, public opinion has entirely gone with the operation of the Act."

In 1881, when the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill was before the House, Mr. Gladstone in the course of his speech said, referring to the proposal to exclude Cardiff from the operation of the Bill:—

> "We have had experience in Ireland of such exceptions in regard to this subject. In the Sunday Closing Bill for Ireland they were granted for the sake of passing the Bill rather than on the convictions of the party making the concession. But now I understand that Irish opinion, after the experience there has been, is altogether unfavourable to a continuance of these exclusions, and when the temporary Measure that was passed for Ireland comes to be renewed, undoubtedly Parliament will be asked to put an end to these exclusions and to pass a Bill for the whole of Ireland."

In 1882, when the Act was about to expire, a house-to-house canvass in the five exempted cities was made, with the following result:—In Dublin, 34,606 voted in favour of the entire closing of public houses on Sunday, and 8,117 against; in Belfast, 23,958 voted in favour of it, and 2,912 against; in Cork, 9,605 voted in favour of it, and 1,870 against; in Limerick, 5,600 voted in favour of it, and 550 against; and in Waterford, 3,495 voted in favour of it, and 290 against. The original Act, however, was not made permanent, and ever since 1882 it has been renewed year by year in the Expiring Laws Continuance Acts. In 1883 and 1884 Mr. Gladstone's Government brought in Bills to make it permanent, and to extend its provisions to the five exempted cities, but those efforts did not result in legislation. Sir G. Trevelyan, the then Chief Secretary, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill in June, 1884, said that he had come to the conclusion that Sunday closing had been a great and almost unmixed benefit to those parts of the country where it had been in operation, and that it might be hopefully and confidently extended to the five exempted cities. In 1888 a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the working of the Act, and 35 witnesses were called before it. That Committee recommended that the Act of 1878 should be made perpetual, that the qualifying distance under the *bonâ fide* provision should be extended to six miles, and that all houses for the sale of intoxicating liquors in Ireland should be closed at 9 p.m. on Saturdays. A Bill in accordance with those recommendations was brought in, and the present Measure was identical with it. In 1890 the Bill passed the Second Reading of that House, the numbers being—for, 242; and against, 78. The Irish Members in favour of the Bill were as two to one. In 1891 the Bill was again read a Second time, by 248 to 94. In 1895 it was again read a Second time, by 170 to 71. It was then referred to the Grand Committee on Trade, but in consequence of the dissolution of Parliament it was lost. The principle of the Bill now before the House had been supported by Governments representing three different parties—the Liberal Party as it existed before the division in 1885, and the Party which is now on the opposite Benches, and the Party which is on this side of the House. It has been advocated by four Chief Secretaries. In 1889 a large deputation in favour of the Bill waited upon the present Leader of the House, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, when the right hon. Gentleman said:—

> "It has become clearly manifest that every man who has had the opportunity and the desire impartially to examine the results of this legislation in Ireland during the ten years in which it has been in force, has been driven, willingly or unwillingly, to the conclusion that that legislation has conferred vast benefits upon the population, and that it should, under no circumstances, be allowed to lapse. I have consulted the Prime Minister on the subject, and am authorised to say that if a Bill is not brought in as a Government Measure, we shall, at all events, do what we can to aid Mr. Lea, or whoever may have charge of it, to bring the controversy to a final conclusion."

In a subsequent speech, he said:—

> "I was, as Minister for Ireland, responsible for doing my best to pass through the House of Commons a Sunday-closing Bill for that country. The great mass of the population of every class, rank, and character were in favour of it."

The right hon. Member for Montrose (Mr. Morley) when Chief Secretary was equally emphatic. Replying to a deputation in 1892, he said:—

> "Nothing shall be left undone on my part to give all the facilities that the subject requires, and to enable Sir Thomas Lea, or

> whoever else has charge of the Bill, to bring to an end what is really almost a scandal. Here is a Measure, not absolutely unanimously desired by the whole of Ireland, but desired by all parties in Ireland, by representatives and the great bulk of the members of both the two great religious communities into which Ireland, like other countries, is divided; politics do not enter into it, and it is a scandal that a Measure of so simple a kind should be put off year after year in this unsatisfactory way, this unworkmanlike way, put off upon an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, and that the five exempted towns should be precluded from advantages which an enormous number of inhabitants of these towns fervently desire."

In the present Session the Home Secretary gave a very similar testimony. Speaking on the Debate on Sunday closing in England, he said:—

> "In Ireland, according to the report which has recently been made, and according to all the information I have, Sunday closing is a success."

Outside politics all the religious bodies in Ireland were in favour of it. The Bishops of the Church of Ireland were, he believed, unanimous on the subject. The great majority of the Roman Catholic Bishops were on the same side, and 17 of them had signed a petition in favour of this Bill, and it was also supported by the General Assembly of the Presbyterians and by the Methodist body. A memorial recently presented to Lord Cadogan asking the Government to support it was signed, among others, by 29 Bishops, by 993 magistrates, by 237 Town Commissioners and Poor Law Guardians, by 1,735 merchants and employers of labour. It can hardly indeed be disputed that the main features of the Bill are supported by an overwhelming preponderance of Irish opinion in all classes. ["Hear, hear!"] There was, in fact, no opposition to its general principle except from the trade. ["Hear, hear!"] He admitted that that was a very important exception, as the power of the publican vote was well known to every section of the House—[*laughter*]—and as the House would understand, there were conditions of parties when the support of that body was peculiarly desirable. While he said there was an immense consensus of opinion in favour of the Bill, he did not pretend to say that every detail of it was equally acceptable. The promoters of the Bill had simply embodied in it the recommendations of the Commission of 1888, and they brought forward the same Bill which had passed the House of Commons three times. He believed there was no real dispute in Ireland outside the trade about renewing the Act of 1878, and very little about Sunday closing at nine o'clock in the evening. The evils of Saturday night drinking had been attested by every judge of Irish life, and this part of the Measure was, in his opinion, even more important than Sunday closing. The spread of the Saturday half-holiday had rendered it easy for everyone to get what he wanted before nine o'clock. There were, however, special cases in which hardship might be caused by the change, and such cases the promoters of the Bill were quite prepared to meet. The cases of music-halls and theatres, Saturday entertainments in hotels and restaurants could all be considered in Committee. He believed there was no real opposition to the extension of the qualification for a *bonâ fide* traveller from three to six miles. He could not, however, claim the same substantial unanimity in favour of complete closing in the five towns. There had been a very considerable amount of independent opinion in favour of opening public-houses in these towns from two to five on Sunday instead of the present hours and instead of shutting them up altogether. Mr. Madden, who presided over the Committee of 1888, and who declared that the general principles of Sunday, and still more Saturday closing, was supported by "overwhelming majorities of all classes in Ireland" was in favour of this change. Several other competent judges supported him, and an Amendment to that effect was carried unanimously in the House of Lords in 1893. He was very much inclined to agree with it. He thought it was an Amendment which ought to be considered in Committee in a conciliatory spirit, and he believed most of his hon. Friends who supported the Bill were quite prepared to accept this alleviation. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not, however, think that the danger of shebeening or unlicensed drinking which had been put forward as an argument in favour of exempting the five large towns was a serious one. The Commission of 1888 reported that those evils had not arisen to any appreciable extent under the Act of 1878. Sir George Trevelyan, in the Debate on this Measure in 1891, said that when he was Chief Secretary he made a careful inquiry on the subject from the resident magistrates throughout Ireland, and that the overwhelming majority of them declared that the Act, as far as it had gone, had not led to shebeening. "There is absolutely overwhelming proof," he said, "that Sunday closing in Ireland has not led to an increase of shebeening." The case of Glasgow strongly confirms that view. Glasgow is a much larger city than any in Ireland, and it contains a very poor Irish population which is larger than the whole population of three of the exempted Irish towns. Yet this Sunday closing has proved a perfect success. In 1895, when some doubt was thrown on this fact, the hon. Member for the Bridgeton Division (Sir C. Cameron) declared drunkenness had greatly diminished; that Sunday arrests had sunk to one-sixth of what they were on other days, and that no class, not even the publicans themselves, wished the public-houses to be open on Sundays. ["Hear, hear!"] This was the case he had to present to the House. He frankly confessed that he did not belong to the more advanced wing of the temperance party. His own view was that there should be as little legislative interference as possible with private habits, and he thought they ought never in these questions to precede public opinion, but only to follow it, and even lag a little behind it. ["Hear, hear!"] He believed Measures of this kind ought only to be carried when called for by a large and a persistent majority, and even then should be as far as possible tentative and gradual. It was because the Bill before the House seemed to him fully to meet these requirements that he had undertaken to bring it forward. One part of the Bill simply renewed a Measure which had been in operation successfully for no less than 19 years and which no one wished to repeal. The other parts of the Bill had been before the public since the Report of the Commission of 1888, and had been endorsed by a succession of large majorities in the House of Commons. Surely, then, it was time to bring this long controversy to an end, and, with whatever modification the House might think right, pass a Measure which in its main features was approved by an overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland of all classes, creeds, and sections of opinion, and which would be likely in the highest degree to benefit the social and moral condition of the country. [*Cheers.*]

*Mr. J. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said he should endeavour to do what he could to second the Motion. He must say that he looked on this question as one which was in a somewhat abnormal condition. As already stated, this Bill had been supported by leading Members of the present Government. It was supported by two previous Governments. It had been endorsed by the recommendations of two Select Committees. It had been Read three times by overwhelming majorities, and passed with some modifications in the House of Lords. The majority of the people of Ireland were in favour of it, and particularly the supporters of the Government in that country. But notwithstanding all this, the House had been unable, or unwilling, to place the Bill permanently on the Statute Book. The case in favour of the Bill was so strong in 1878 that the House was compelled to pass the Measure for four years. After four years' trial the Bill was so far a success that it was included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Why, then, was it not made permanent? In his opinion it was because of the determined opposition of the English and Irish liquor trade. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a selfish opposition. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a social question, but there was an attempt to make it a political one. He refused to debate the question on that line. He was told that he was a precious Home Ruler trying to defeat the Irish by English and Scotch votes. He hoped those votes would never be devoted to a worse purpose. Had they not endeavoured to get Home Rule from the self-same votes? It was a very peculiar theory that these publicans had. They issued a Whip signed by two Irishmen only and four Englishmen. The publicans used the English vote when it suited them, and repudiated it when it did not suit them. For his part he would be glad to use English and Scotch votes in the interests of Irish remedial measures at all times. One would think that the publicans were about to be deprived of their whole trade. To the whole trade in Ireland that would only mean two hours of sale on a Saturday night. In the name of humanity surely the trade might forego the gains screwed out of poor wretches at the fag-end of a Saturday night. ["Hear, hear!"] The poor creatures—the publicans—had to be pitied. But what right had the publicans in these five towns to keep open on Sundays while the publicans in the rural districts had to close? Then they had the argument about liberty. Rank cant. Liberty to grow rich and enslave their assistants in the fumes of liquor for 17 to 18 hours a day, and for seven days a week, while the publican and the brewer were driving in their carriages. That was liberty. But the finest view was that the trade opposed this Bill in the interests of temperance. If they didn't keep open, the working man would take large quantities of drink to his home, and even his family would turn drunkards on Sunday! They kept their houses open on Sunday in the interests of humanity. He didn't believe it. On the contrary, he hoped the House would wipe out this scandal and pass this Bill by a large majority.

Mr. J. DALY (Monaghan, S.) proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months." He said it was a pity that the duty of moving the rejection of the Bill was placed in his hands, but at the same time he depended on the goodness of the cause he advocated. They all listened with pleasure to the speeches which the hon. Member for Trinity College delivered in that House from time to time, but he would remind him that his speech here in endeavouring to take away the liberty and privileges of the people of Ireland was scarcely in harmony with his writings. As for the hon. Member for Fermanagh, he thought that, if the hon. Member believed in weak drinks, he used strong language. [*Laughter.*] He was as anxious to see Ireland temperate as anybody, but he did not believe that this was the right way to go about it. If this was to be good for Ireland it should be good for England also. The great Tory majority in the House of Commons was due to the influence of the publican, brewer, and distiller of England. This Measure would greatly injure the brewers and distillers of Ireland, but the promoters of the Measure had not taken into account the interests of that class of person, because they had no influence with the people and could not control votes. Had that class of trader any influence among the people of Ireland he was quite sure that some of the promoters of the Bill would not have brought in a Measure for coercing the people of Ireland, and not the people of England. The people in Ireland spent per head on intoxicating liquors £2 13s. per annum, while in England the sum was £4 2s., so that Ireland was comparatively a sober country as compared with England. If the public houses in Ireland were closed to-morrow there would be created a group of shebeens and bogus clubs that would take twice the number of constabulary they had to look after them, and he was surprised that any Nationalist Member who desired a reduction of the police force should think for a moment about giving his support to the Bill. He would, therefore, give this Measure his most strenuous opposition. Again, if this Bill were placed on the Statute Book, men who had been in the habit of visiting the public house on the Sunday evening would in all probability take drink to their homes, and if the House desired to do anything, it desired to avoid setting a bad example. But by passing this Bill men would take home liquor and drink it before their wives and children, and hence intemperance and demoralisation would be encouraged. ["Hear, hear!"] Archbishop Walsh was strongly opposed to the Bill, and had written stating that within the last few months the bogus club system had largely increased, and added that the evil was growing at a sufficiently rapid rate to cause alarm. He also stated that he was opposed to these so-called temperance Measures, which restricted the licensed trade, so long as the system of bogus clubs was allowed to continue. ["Hear, hear!"] He read extracts showing that the great bulk of police magistrates, resident magistrates, district inspectors, and the chief magistrate of Dublin was opposed to the Measure. Total Sunday closing prevailed in Cardiff, and a plebiscite was taken quite recently on the question, and out of a total vote of 11,127 only 2,574 voted in favour of maintaining Sunday closing. If men could not get drink legally they would get it illegally, and that would be a curse to Ireland, and there would be many shebeens springing up. He believed that this Bill was a direct blow at the publicans of Ireland. The vast majority of the publicans were Nationalists, and he was surprised that any Nationalist Member occupying a seat in that House should get up and advocate the taking away of the bread from the wives and children of those publicans. He would remind the House that there were very few cases of drunkenness in the five exempted towns on Sundays. He believed that for the whole year only 19 arrests took place in all those towns, and as these arrests took place from eight in the morning until eight o'clock on Monday morning, would any hon. Member say that they were not on account of the bad drink sold in the bogus clubs and the shebeens? He was as anxious to see the people of Ireland sober as any Member in that House, but he thought that bringing in such a Bill as this was putting the cart before the horse, and he hoped there would be such a majority against the Second Reading as would prevent the cranks and fanatics from ever bothering the House with this Measure again. He believed that every hon. Member who voted for him that day would be voting for the freedom of the people of Ireland and against the curtailment of their rights and privileges—which were already very much curtailed—without in any way interfering with the privileges of Englishmen.

*MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.), in seconding the rejection of the Bill, complimented the hon. Member for Trinity College on the moderation he had shown in moving the Bill. and said that if it were not that he believed the hon. Gentleman was entirely wrong in a great deal he had laid before the House, he would feel in voting against him, like a pagan about to plant an arrow in the breast of a mediæval saint. The hon. Gentleman had told the House that 34 bishops and deans were in favour of Sunday closing, but he omitted to give the religion of those bishops and deans. He believed there were 36 Catholic and 37 Protestant bishops and deans, so that, taking the 34 from the 73 there was a majority against the Sunday closing. He did not attach any importance to the argument that 34,000 houses were visited the occupants of which were in favour of the Bill, for they all knew how these bogus attempts of arriving at public opinion had worked. The hon. Member for Trinity College had told them that he was in favour of public houses being opened from two o'clock to five, but he thought the hon. Gentleman would agree that he had no right to state on what hours on Sunday the working classes desired to take refreshment. His first objection to the Bill was that he objected to any question affecting the vital interest of any trade in Ireland being dealt with by this House, or being decided by any tribunal than that of Irishmen in an Irish Assembly. Secondly, if it must be dealt with in this House, then the present moment, when a Royal Commission was sitting to consider and Report on the Licensing Laws, was not the proper moment for it to be brought forward. A Royal Commission had been ordered by the House to collect information for them, and therefore it would be both unfair to the House and also to the trade to adjudicate on the Bill that was placed before them. He objected altogether to a question of such magnitude being dealt with in a private Member's Bill, but he also objected to the Bill being brought before an English Parliament for the same reason that the late Charles Stewart Parnell spoke against any attempt at tampering with the Irish Licensing Question. The late Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell, in April 1891, when the Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill was introduced, said:—

> "If the hon. Members do not wish to prejudice this question beforehand by their meddlesome interference and bungling attempts to legislate for the wants of people whom they cannot possibly understand, and in reference to a matter of which they are profoundly ignorant, then they will vote against the Second Reading of this Bill. If they believe that the time is near when Ireland will decide this question for herself—if they believe their own declarations—they will vote against this Bill, knowing that no time will be lost by leaving the consideration and settlement of this question to a Parliament which we hope to see established in Dublin."

He regretted to see the names of the hon. Member for Cork, the Member for Longford and the hon. Member for South Fermanagh on the back of the Bill, for the policy of Mr. Parnell in 1891 was right, and the policy of Mr. Parnell in 1891 was still right in 1897. It was not possible for this Bill to obtain such a position on the Order Papers of the House as would enable it to be fully, freely and fairly discussed, and nothing had occurred to offer a reasonable excuse for interfering in any way with a respectable class of traders who carried on their business under the licences which this Bill proposed to deal with. Did the promoters of the Bill contend that Ireland was a more drunken nation than England when they desired to legislate in such an exceptional manner? He was astonished that Irish Members, whether Tories or Home Rulers, could have been induced to put their names on the back of this Bill. Of course he excepted the Member for South Belfast; he was not at all surprised at seeing his name on the back of this Bill, as he believed he would condemn all Irishmen to drink lemonade, or to put it more appropriately, "orangeade," not only on Sunday, but every day of the week. [*Laughter.*] If the promoters of this Bill honestly thought that Ireland was a more drunken nation than England, if they honestly believed that this unseemly haste to legislate for their own country was of urgent necessity, of such importance that they could not even wait for the Report of the Royal Commission now sitting, let him assuage their fears and their thirst for legislation by pointing out that the Royal Commission on Financial Matters in Ireland proved beyond doubt that the expenditure on intoxicating liquor, per annum in Ireland was only £2 13s. per head as against £4 2s. per head in England. The requirements, habits and customs of the Irish people were so different from those either in Scotland or England, that it would be grossly unfair to legislate in this manner without the fullest inquiry, and without considering all the facts and circumstances of the case. This Bill proposed to arbitrarily interfere with a most deserving class of traders, and to brand Ireland with the stigma of intemperance, and to wholly ignore the wishes of the people of Ireland and the working classes of that country. He had before him the Reports of the evidence of the ex-resident magistrate for Belfast, Mr. McCarthy, and the Chief Police Commissioner, Mr. Singleton, who both stated that no change ought to take place in the Sunday hours of sale at present in force. He had also the leading opinions of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Sir David Harold, the Under Secretary for Ireland, and several bishops and priests, well known as earnest and religious advisers of all subjects connected with the welfare of Ireland, and they one and all were absolutely adverse from a change in the law as regards Sunday closing, and they asserted that, far from furthering the cause of temperance, it would do exactly the contrary. He had also the evdence of Sir John Bridge, police magistrate of London; Colonel Moorsom, Chief Constable of Lancashire; Mr. Macenzie, Chief Constable of Cardiff; and Sir Henry Poland, Q.C., leading member and Alderman of the London County Council. Their evidence was given before the Royal Commission now sitting. He did not say there were no ways and Bills to be devised by which the Licensing Laws of this country could be improved, but this Bill was certainly not one of them. No doubt many Members had been in Paris on Sunday, and it must have surprised them to see how little drunkenness there was in that great city. With all the cafés and all the places of amusement open both day and night, there was less drunkenness there on Sunday than in any small Scotch or English town that could be named where Sunday closing was in force. He maintained that they had no right to prevent the working classes of Ireland from getting refreshment on Sunday, or to make their only day of rest unacceptable to them. Personally, he should like to see all the places of amusement and refreshment open after three o'clock on Sunday. It was a black, dreary Sunday that Sabbatarians desired to impose on the people of this country, and it was more conducive to intemperance than all the public houses of the United Kingdom. He should be glad to see the café system tried here. But what did they seek to do by this Bill? To impose upon a Roman Catholic country like Ireland the dreary and uninviting Sunday that had certainly not brought temperance to Protestant countries that had adopted it. He welcomed the idea that gave us military bands on Sundays in our parks, and he hoped to see refreshment kiosks erected by Government for the comfort of our working classes both here and in Ireland; and instead of penal laws being enacted and brought forward like this Bill, he desired to see the comfort and the amusement of the people more fully considered. He claimed to know something of the working classes of this country. He was for some considerable time Her Majesty's Inspector of Factories in the south-east of London and in the Black Country, and, if hon. Members really desired to promote temperance, let them do something to give the working classes amusement and comfort on their one day's rest from toil, to bring light and comfort into their homes. Let them do all they could for their education, instead of bringing forward these wretched penal enactments directed against a certain trade in this country, a trade that paid half of the taxation of the country. If this Government really wished to do something in the cause of temperance, let them do something for the education of Ireland, and pay the money they owed them towards that purpose; let them give the grant he asked for last year for the Christian Brothers' Schools, and allow them in Ireland to make their own local laws. This would do more for the cause of temperance than 50 Sunday Closing Bills. He asked the House, with confidence, to reject this Bill—a Bill drawn against the interests of a well-conducted class of traders and against the comfort of the public, to please the morbid prejudices of a reckless and fanatical minority.

Mr. J. A. RENTOUL (Down, E.) said the opposition to the Bill was a trade one from beginning to end, both in England and in Ireland. No proof had been given in support of the statement that the petitions in favour of the Bill were bogus petitions. This Bill had reached its majority this year. It was 21 years since this movement began; the Bill had passed the House three times; it had twice passed Select Committees with approval; it had passed the House of Lords, and it had received the approval of every Chief Secretary for the last 17 years. Now what explanation did the hon. Member who had just sat down give of this extraordinary fact? He said this House wished to put on record their belief that temperance was a good thing, and, having put that on record, like sensible men, they determined to proceed no further. Just let them apply that to Home Rule for Ireland. The hon. Member's first argument would apply word for word to that which he advocated so strongly, his intense adherence to the principle of Home Rule. The hon. Member's next statement was still more extraordinary. He said:—"The Mover of the Bill did not believe in his own Bill." That was cheap argument to put before the House. The hon. Member for Trinity College was successful in the ballot, but that fact did not compel him to bring in this Bill; but having before him numbers of other Measures, he felt nevertheless, that the very best thing he could do for his country was to bring forward this Bill. [*Cheers.*] Therefore, the reference of the hon. Member to the hon. Member for Trinity College was a very unfortunate one indeed. ["Hear, hear!"] It was said that this Measure should be adjudicated upon by an Irish Parliament. What would have been the fate of this Measure if it had been so adjudicated upon in the past? On every occasion when it had come before this House, it had been supported by a majority of Irish Members, and consequently, if its fate had been in the hands of an Irish Parliament, it would have been carried over and over again. [*Cheers.*] Of the names on the back of the Bill, one was that of the hon. Gentleman who was the Leader of almost the entire Irish Party for two or three years, until he resigned his post (Mr. Justin McCarthy), the one Irish Leader who was not kicked out; another was that of the hon. Member for Galway City (Mr. Pinkerton, a Nationalist); a third was "Ireland's only statesman" (Mr. Blake), a Gentleman who would be considered the most experienced by far of the Nationalist Members at the present time; and, lastly, he believed one of the hon. Members for Cork City (Mr. Maurice Healy) had come over specially for the purpose of voting in favour of the Bill. There was no city in Ireland that knew its own business better than Cork, and he did not believe that any Member for that city, whatever his private views on the Bill, would come over from Cork in defiance of the opinions of the city on the subject. Therefore the voice of Cork was practically unanimous for the Bill. He rather thought the hon. Member for South Monaghan was himself in the trade.

Mr. DALY: I am not in the trade. I hold no brief at all in the matter.

Mr. RENTOUL said he was glad the hon. Member had cleared his character at once. [*Laughter.*] It did him great credit. They heard a good deal in the last Parliament about *agents provocateurs;* now he considered that the publicans of Ireland were *agents provocateurs*—[*cries of* "Oh!"]—and that was the view of the majority of the Irish people also. [*Cheers.*] They felt that the public house was a temptation they had difficulty in withstanding, and they petitioned this House to take the temptation out of the way. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] The hon. Member for South Monaghan, who believed not in Acts of Parliament but in the clergy making the people sober, was, he thought, a Presbyterian.

Mr. DALY: I am not a Presbyterian. I am a Roman Catholic.

Mr. RENTOUL was pleased indeed to have that assurance. [*Laughter.*] Well, he understood that the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church were, almost to a man, in favour of this Bill. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Who were the Bishops of that Church who wanted the Bill rejected? Because no one could doubt that the clergy of any Church whatever wanted to see their people sober. ["Hear, hear!"] He believed the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church were in overwhelming numbers in favour of the Bill. Coming to the Presbyterian Church, he asserted that not only were the whole Presbyterian clergy in favour of it, but there was not a man who dared be anything else, unless he wanted to see himself out of ear with the entire of his congregation, and so lose every atom of power and influence with his people. [*Cheers.*] It was said that the Conservative majority in the present Parliament was due to the brewers and distillers; but he denied that altogether. Walthamstow was a constituency which he knew well, and he expected that the Government candidate would win the seat at the by-election by 2,000 votes, until he heard that he was a distiller, and then he knew that it would be lost. Hon. Members urged that to close the public-houses meant to open the clubs. But why should they be afraid of that? If the clubs increased the consumption of liquor it was better for the trade. But in any case surely Parliament could deal with the clubs. He was asked, "Would you deprive the poor man of his beer?" Yes, he would, if the poor man was spending one-sixth of his entire income on drink for himself. Recently two appeals had been made for Ireland on the ground of her poverty. As to the rating question, the amount spent on Sunday in the public-houses would do all that the Irish Members asked Parliament to do in that connection. And as to the question of rent, while the rental of Ireland was nine millions, the liquor bill was 12 millions. An hon. Member had said that Ireland was, comparatively with England, a teetotal country, because she drank only half as much as England in proportion to population. Yes, but Ireland had only one-tenth of the wealth of England, and therefore she was spending five times more than she ought to in proportion to her resources. [*Cheers.*] The opposition to the Bill was a trade opposition. A whip had been sent out signed by three or four members of the trade on the Ministerial side of the House; and that morning Members had been roused out of their beds at half-past Two by a telegram containing a wild appeal to vote against the Bill, and signed by a brewer and distiller who was lately a Member of the House. When hon. Gentlemen acted in this way they were degrading themselves and the trade to which they belonged. [*Cheers.*] If the trade was a good and legitimate trade, let it stand on its own legs. Other trades did not issue these appeals, and members belonging to them did not come down to the House to speak on their own behalf. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a degrading spectacle. One hon. Member had spoken of the enormous amount of the taxes of the country paid by the trade. It was not the trade that paid the taxes, but the clothes off the backs of the women of Ireland—[*cheers*] and the earnings of poor miserable wretches whose wives and children were starving. The two speeches which had been delivered from the other side were enough to sink the opposition to the Bill. He was sorry to see Members in the position of the hon. Member for the Harbour Division opposing this Bill; but he hoped that Irish Members generally would be true to their country's interests, and refuse to be tied to the heels of the trade. He hoped they would follow the lead of the clergy and Bishops on this question. [*Cheers.*]

On the return of Mr. SPEAKER, after the usual interval,

MR. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said the hon. Member for Dublin University twitted those who moved the rejection of the Bill with having no arguments in support of that Motion. He himself submitted that it lay upon those who proposed this Measure of exceptional legislation to give some argument for its adoption in Ireland so soon after the rejection by an overwhelming majority of a similar Bill for England. No argument of any weight or importance had been advanced in favour of the Bill. If the advocates of the Bill wished to suppress drinking, let them be impartial, and do so in the House of Commons, the clubs, and the private home circle. There was no evidence that drunkenness was on the increase in Ireland. The hon. Member for Dublin University himself denied that drunkenness was increasing there. In his well-known work, "Democracy and Liberty," he said:—

> "It must, in the first place, be noticed that the greatly increasing sensitiveness of public opinion on the question of drink is very far from implying that the evil itself is an increasing one."

There was strong reason to believe that the exact opposite was the case.

> "A hundred years ago," he added, "drunkenness was rather the rule than the exception among the upper class. But, with changed habits, and under the stress of public opinion, it has, in their section, almost disappeared. . . . . This vast change in the social life of the nation has not been effected by law or restriction, or even by religion, but by a simple change of habits, tastes, and ideals. No doubt a similar change has taken place, though not to so great an extent, among the poor. . . . The immense weight of the public-house vote and the teetotal vote in every part of the British Isles has placed the question in the very centre of the maelstrom of party politics."

*MR. LECKY, interposing, remarked that he had expressly said that Irish Sunday closing was not a Party question.

MR. HARRINGTON said he was contrasting the hon. Gentleman's speech in the House with what he had calmly written in the privacy of his study. The hon. Member for East Down had read them a homily on the cause of temperance. If it meant anything, it meant that drinking should be suppressed altogether. Let hon. Members and the upper classes of society set the example themselves, and then the restrictive legislation of the House would be received with more respect. This restrictive legislation was not to suppress drink, but was happily described by the hon. Member for Dublin University in "Democracy and Liberty" as "the result of a gust of genuine, but often ignorant fanaticism." The upper classes sought to impose on the poor restrictions as regards drinking which they would not submit to themselves. He himself had always been a rigid teetotaller. He had never known the taste of spirituous drinks. But he could never associate himself with the narrowness of spirit and bigotry which was at the bottom of all the temperance associations he knew. Their funds were wasted, not in making men sober, but in a vindictive warfare against men who differed from them in opinion. During the 12 years he had sat in the House, his policy had always been consistent. He was entirely in favour of the suppression of drunkenness, but there was no reason, common sense, or logic to place restrictions upon certain classes of society which were not imposed all round. If the present law for the suppression of drunkenness was not strong enough, let it be strengthened. A man could be punished for being drunk in the street, but the man who, by his drunkenness, ruined his home and made a hell of his own household went free. His wife, his children, his neighbours and others who suffered by his conduct should have the power to obtain protection against him. This Bill would not prevent drunkenness. To close public houses on Sundays would lead to an increase of drinking at clubs or shebeens, and in the home circle. Among other evils arising would be an enormous increase in shebeens and bogus clubs. A man of position need not drink in the presence of his children. But a poor man living in one or two rooms could not well prevent their noticing his bad example. There were safeguards connected with drinking in public houses which did not apply to it in clubs. Public houses were liable to be visited at any time by the police, and a publican was punished for allowing drunkenness on his premises. The club was not restricted as to hours of closing; it was free from inspection by the police, and money could be spent in clubs, not only in drink, but in every form of gambling. Dr. Macalister, Bishop of Down and Connor, said:—

> "I prefer to see the Act of 1878 renewed in the rural districts than the extension of total Sunday closing to large towns, where it is accompanied by shebeening and female drinking. Total Sunday closing is known to lead in large towns to illicit drinking and shebeening with their accompanying immoralities, and what is a greater evil beyond the power of the police or the law to correct—female drinking."

There was no evidence that such a Bill as this was necessary in Ireland. The consumption of drink had increased in Ireland, even in the five exempted cities. The average of arrests for drunkenness in the whole of the five cities was as low as 34. Most of the arrests were of persons who got drunk at bogus clubs and shebeens by 8 a.m. and 2 p.m. on Sundays, when the public houses were closed. As to the argument that four Irish Chief Secretaries had supported the principle of the Measure, that did not show that the people of Ireland were in favour. Irish Chief Secretaries knew very little of the country. He could not imagine a position which placed a man more completely out of touch with the country than the isolation of Dublin Castle. In the public house there was always the guarantee that the man who conducted it was respectable, that no person in drink would be served, and that the quality of the liquor was good. On the other hand, the men who ran the clubs which would be established if the Bill was passed, would be able to sell absolutely what they liked. The supporters of the Bill had not made an attempt to define their position. They had only given what they supposed to be a general description of the state of public opinion. So far from the majority of Irish Members being in favour of the Bill, as had been stated, he believed the Division would show the contrary. Reference had been made to a house-to-house canvass. No reliance could be placed on the evidence of opinion so obtained, unless it had been obtained by some properly constituted authority. Such evidence as had been obtained in that way could have no weight with rational men. How was a general demand on the part of the people for this Measure shown? There were men who had practically gone mad on this question of drink, and their mad enthusiasm ought to receive no sympathy in the House. If a case of an increase in drunkenness in Ireland had been made out, let it be dealt with; but if not, let not the House be deceived by general expressions of opinion into giving a vote which would deny to the poor man that which any member of society in a high social state enjoyed at his desire. ["Hear, hear!"] One of the provisions of the Bill was to extend Saturday closing. What would be the effect? Take the city of Dublin. At present it was the only city he knew in which a man coming off the sea at night could not get refreshment after 11 o'clock. It was now proposed to close earlier still, at 9 o'clock on Saturday night, and then a man coming off the sea would be precluded from getting refreshment after that hour. There was no reason for such a proposal, and those who were putting it forward were only doing so at the instigation of a genuine, perhaps, but ignorant fanaticism. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) said that every day he was more and more convinced of the necessity for this Bill, and of its application to Ireland. Year after year Irish Members had declared in favour of the Bill, over and over again respectable Irish society had demanded it, and though the supporters of the Bill had sometimes had a successful Division on a Wednesday, they could get no nearer the object of their desires. That state of things was little less than a public scandal. ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill was denounced as an attack on the liberties of the people and the interests of a great trade. What did it do? Over the bulk of Ireland public houses were open for 16 hours a day, or 96 hours a week. This Bill sought to take off one hour in the week. ["Hear, hear!"] In the five large towns public houses were open 17 hours a day, or 107 hours a week, and the proposal of the Bill was to cut off the odd seven. He could not see how that could be described as a monstrous invasion of liberty. ["Hear, hear!"] He held that the Irish people were a great deal better in every way than the

English, and he declined to accept what the Englishmen did as at all a standard in this matter; and whether Irishmen drank as much intoxicating liquor as Englishmen or not, they drank a great deal more than they required; whether their drink bill was as large, relatively speaking, as the English drink bill, it had certainly attained proportions which constituted a gross scandal. But after all, the drink consumed in Ireland was consumed by a relatively small number of persons. The average population was exceedingly temperate. The Irish peasant spent very little on whisky or other intoxicating liquors. He lived a sober, abstemious life, and in that respect he could be well compared with the peasant of France or of any other country. Drinking in Ireland was necessarily concentrated in the large centres of population, and if the drink bill was regarded from that point of view it impressed the mind much more than it did when put forward in another way. His hon. Friend the Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin said the supporters of the Bill had advanced no argument in its support. The hon. Member for Trinity College very truly said that the time for argument had long passed. Twenty years ago they argued this question out; but he would present one argument in support of the Bill. It was that they commended the Bill to the House as an experiment which had already been tried in Ireland, and which had succeeded. Sunday closing had been in force in the rural districts of Ireland for 20 years, and was there any man in his senses who would move the repeal of the Act? No one would for a moment dream of suggesting such a reversion to barbarism as that would be. They were told that there would be shebeening and illicit trade in unlicensed houses, as well as in public houses themselves. Of course there would be shebeening and illicit trade, but it would not attain the horrible proportions they had heard described to-day. There was nothing sacred about the public house as some hon. Members would have them suppose. His hon. Friend the Member for South Dublin seemed to think that the public house was an institution set up for the moral and intellectual improvement of the Irish people—he did not know what depth of degradation and misery they would reach if they had not this self-sacrificing and heroic trade thrusting itself into the gap and standing between the country and demoralisation. But they were not such sucking babes as to accept as gospel language of that kind. A large and discreditable amount of drunkenness took place in Ireland, as in England, and what he desired to ask was where that drunkenness was caused? Was it not as plain as the light of day that that drunkenness was due to the public house, and the public house alone? What was asked was that some small check should be put upon those houses, that the State should step in between the drunkard and tempter. Much was said about liberty and the privileges of the people. The artisan of the great cities finished work at one or two o'clock on Saturday. Surely between two and nine o'clock on Saturday was quite long enough for the most zealous worshipper of Bacchus to spend in the public house. Surely after nine o'clock the wife and children might get a chance. Liberty was a good thing, and coercion was a bad thing, but let them think a little of the wretched wives and hungry children. No decent artisan or labourer could greatly complain if the State stepped in and said, "At nine o'clock on Saturday night you may go home and spend the remainder of the evening with your wife and family." When the question of Sunday closing was originally proposed, Irish publicans themselves said, "Oh, it is not the Sunday, but the Saturday night drinking which does the harm." The promoters of the Bill had adopted the publicans' views, and were denounced as if they were doing something unheard of. He did not believe one bit in the argument about shebeening. That was an argument which, if good at all, was good against all restrictions on the sale of drink. They heard a great deal about bogus clubs, and he supposed such clubs were an evil which would have to be met. But bogus clubs had been successfully dealt with in Dublin. He thought that the gentlemen who resorted to clubs in London and elsewhere might very well make a self-denying ordinance and subject themselves to the same restrictions as applied to public houses. Of all the cant which was talked on this question of temperance this cant about the rich man's club was the worst. Was it in clubs that they saw men drunk, or hanging round their doors the ragged forms of women and hungry children? What hypocrisy it was! Clubs were kept decent for the sake of the gentlemen who frequented them, and therefore he did not think that there was any substance in the complaint as to the clubs. Here, however, a great trade organisation was banded and leagued against this Sunday closing reform; and if he had to make a choice between tolerating the existing state of things, with all the scandals and evils which resulted from it, and doing in the process some injury to the publican, he said that the personal interests of the publican or his trade could not be allowed to stand between society and its advancement in civilisation, in decency and in comfort. He believed that the fierce opposition offered to the Bill was the best testimony to the good that it would effect if passed into law. He trusted that, regardless of trade interests, and as to how this reform might influence any individual, the House would now do something to advance the social improvement of the country.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I rise, not to deal with the general question of temperance legislation, or even with the specific merits or demerits of the Bill now before us, but to make a short statement in the nature rather of personal explanation than of discussion upon the legislation with which we are concerned. As the House is aware, there is at the present moment a Commission sitting, appointed by the Government, which has committed to it the onerous duty of surveying the whole field of liquor legislation, and making recommendations to Parliament on the subject. We have taken up the line that until that Commission has reported, we ought not to be asked to take any practical steps one way or the other to deal with the thorny problems of liquor legislation. [*Cheers.*] I have no doubt that the policy which has guided the Government in other analogous questions in the course of the present Session, is one which my colleagues will as a rule take for their guidance on this occasion; but I propose to vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, and so far to depart from that line of action. My own connection with this particular project of legislation is somewhat different from that of other Gentlemen, official or unofficial, who have given previous votes upon it. In 1888, while I was Chief Secretary, a Committee was appointed to thrash out the whole subject. The Chairman of that Committee was the then Attorney General for Ireland, now Mr. Justice Madden—a man with whom it was a great pleasure and honour for me to act, and whose memory, I am sure, is still kept green in all parts of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] He presided over the labours of that Committee. Witnesses were examined representing every section of society in Ireland, brought from every political party, representing every conceivable interest. I was not a member of the Committee myself, and in a sense, therefore, my information as to its proceedings must be regarded as information derived at second hand. But I had long and anxious conversations with Mr. Madden on the subject, and he told me that in his view there was something aproaching absolute unanimity of public opinion in Ireland in favour of this legislation. [*Cheers.*] Of course, the public opinion in Ireland was not the uninformed public opinion anxious to try a new experiment about which it may have very little information; it was a public opinion which had been educated by some years' experience of precisely analogous legislation extending over the greater part of the country. As the House is aware, this Bill, so far as Sunday closing is concerned, is in actual force over the whole of Ireland, except in the five exempted towns. Mr. Madden went into the question absolutely without prejudice, and he came to the conclusion that, though the Bill in its form of requiring Sunday closing in the large towns the whole of Sunday was too extreme a measure—though he was in favour of the Amendment to which my hon. Friend the Member for Trinity College has given his adhesion—yet he was of opinion—and the Irish Government of his day were of opinion, and the general Government of the country, following the Irish Government, were of opinion—that that Bill was one which might well pass into law with the Amendments which seemed to be necessary. Everyone knows that the fact of this Bill passing its Second Reading to-day will not on that account secure its passing into law during the present Session. A Wednesday Bill, whatever be its fate in the Division Lobbies, if it is not brought on until the middle of May, has no earthly chance of becoming law in the course of the present Session. The question I have to decide for myself is whether I should accept the general position taken up that legislation should be deferred until the Commission Report, or whether I should not, on the other hand, give again a vote in favour of this Bill. No arguments have been brought to my knowledge which alter the view which the Irish Government when I was Chief Secretary arrived at nine years ago. It is possible that the division among gentlemen representing Ireland may show a larger proportion of Irish opinion against the Bill than existed before. I gather that was the view of the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin; but previous Divisions on this subject, as well as the results of the Committee, have shown that Irish opinion, broadly speaking, is strongly in favour of the Bill. [*Cheers.*] Irish opinion, whether the opinion of Nationalists, or Unionists, priests, parsons, ministers, constabulary, or Fenians, is all unanimous, broadly speaking, in favour of this Measure. [*Cheers.*] The country districts in Ireland which are under this legislation are not suffering under slavery. ["Hear, hear!"] We in Scotland, who have had Sunday closing, are not suffering under slavery; and, though I am not an advocate of Sunday closing in England, I cannot admit that where it has already been in operation it can be regarded as an unjustifiable interference with the liberty of the subject. Nor, as far as I am able to judge, can it be described as a serious interference with any trade or profession whatever. Under these circumstances, I propose to support again in the Lobby the opinions which, officially and unofficially, I have supported for nine years, and until evidence is brought before me, either by Debates in this House or by the labours of the Commission, that public opinion has changed in Ireland, or that circumstances in Ireland are such that this Measure will not produce the beneficial effects which Irishmen of all shades of opinion anticipate from it, I do not think I should be acting the part of a consistent politician if I made any change in the course I propose to take.

MR. J. MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): Perhaps I may be allowed to intervene in this Debate for a moment or two, and to say with how much satisfaction I have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, both for the conclusion at which he has arrived and for the grounds on which he based that conclusion. I understood him to say that some of his colleagues were inclined to vote against this Bill on the ground that the subject-matter of it is under the consideration of Lord Peel's Commission. I did not understand the right hon. Gentleman to accept that position himself.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I do accept it as a sound reason for taking the course the right hon. Gentleman objects to, although in my special circumstances and in my historic connection with this Bill, I do not propose to take it myself.

MR. J. MORLEY: That may be so, but the right hon. Gentleman does not himself think that reason sufficient in his own case. It must be remembered that, before the Committee to which the First Lord of the Treasury has referred, the whole subject was most carefully gone into, and it is not conceivable that Lord Peel's Commission can come upon one single new fact, or can find one single argument bearing on the state of Ireland, which can in the least degree affect the vote which any hon. Gentleman in this House ought to give. It was my good fortune practically to follow the right hon. Gentleman in being responsible for Irish affairs, and I think twice it came before our Government to say whether this Bill should or should not be supported; and, exactly for the reasons the right hon. Gentleman opposite has just given, it seems to me it is impossible for anybody, Unionist or Nationalist, to oppose a proposal which has been in actual working over all Ireland except the five exempted towns, and which is undoubtedly, whatever may be the balance of opinion at this moment in this House, the desire of all large organised bodies of opinion in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman referred to Scotland. When I was Chief Secretary, and this subject excited a good deal of attention in the House—partly because it is thought to bear on a similar question affecting England—I made it my business to send over one of our most experienced police officers to Glasgow, where there is a very large Irish population. This experienced officer's conclusion was that the success of the Sunday Closing Act in Glasgow, and not least among the Irish population of Glasgow, had been all that the best friends of that legislation could desire, and that he for his own part was persuaded that the extension of the Act to a city like Belfast, and, I am afraid I must say, still more like Dublin, would produce the most beneficial results, against which there was no practical set-off whatever. I also took measures at that time to find out how the Irish population of New York bore the Sunday Closing Act there; but at that moment, in 1895, there were so many differences and disputes as to the working of the Act in New York that it proved no useful lesson. But the Glasgow evidence was perfectly conclusive so far as it went, and I think it ought to go a very considerable way in inducing hon. Gentlemen in this House to give their vote for this Bill. I, for the same reason as the First Lord of the Treasury, have no hesitation whatever in again voting for the Second Reading of this Bill, and I cannot understand why the sitting of the Peel Commission should be taken as constituting a disability to the judging of this question. I hope that even now some hon. Gentlemen who are thinking of what I may call riding off on Lord Peel's Commission will reconsider the matter, and will assent to a Bill which is undoubtedly required by the great body of public opinion in Ireland.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that what struck him in listening to the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury was that he failed altogether to show why the Government should take up one attitude with reference to an English Sunday Closing Bill on the 10th of February, and an entirely different attitude with reference to the Irish Sunday Closing Bill that day. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman's speech that it was the intention of the Government to take no part as a Government in this matter, but that the various members of the Administration would be permitted to vote as they pleased; but on the 10th of February, when a similar proposal was before the House with regard to England, the Leader of the House and the Home Secretary, the official Whips of the Party, and all the leading Members of the Party, voted against the Bill, on the ground, as stated by the Home Secretary, that a Commission had been appointed to inquire into the whole question of the liquor traffic, and that this was one essential portion of the question. Did the Leader of the House seriously contend that it was a wise or just thing to endeavour, by English, Scotch, and Welsh votes, to force upon Ireland a Bill of this character when he refused to pass a similar Bill for England?

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: The hon. Gentleman's name was on the back of this Bill for ten years.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said that, if the hon. Gentleman who had interrupted him had had patience to wait until he came to the consideration of the merits of the Bill, he would have found that that observation was quite irrelevant. He entirely and absolutely sympathised with the objects of those who were promoting this Bill. The object of the promoters was to further temperance in Ireland; and, while he thought that, on every occasion of that kind, Irish Members ought to take the opportunity of protesting against the prevalent idea in this country that Ireland was, by comparison with England, a drunken country, which was one of the calumnies current in this country; at the same time no man who was at all acquainted with Ireland could deny that drink in that country was a very serious and grave evil—that a great deal of the poverty and of the industrial paralysis, and almost all the crime in Ireland—was directly due to drink. Under these circumstances he would indeed be a poor patriot, and a very shallow politician, and a very shortsighted reformer, who would sit with his hands folded and make no effort whatever to deal with them. He would go further than that and say, he was in favour of moderate and well-considered legislation directed to the object the promoters had in view so long as that legislation fulfilled these two conditions—that it did not unduly interfere with the general convenience and rights of the community, and that the legislation was of such a character as to lead one to suppose that it was likely, in some degree at any rate, to remove the evil which existed. With Sunday Closing as it existed in Ireland at that moment he was in hearty accord. He did not think there was much difference of opinion as to Sunday Closing in the rural districts. At the time he was one of its most strenuous supporters, and he took leave to say that none of those who bitterly opposed it in those days would venture to come forward with a Bill for its repeal. He thought total Sunday closing as it existed in Ireland in the country districts had proved a moderate success. He did not believe it had at all answered the sanguine anticipations of those who advocated it at the time, but still he believed that the balance had been on the right side, and that its working had been in the direction of good. No doubt, while it had not answered the expectations of its supporters, it was true to say that in some cases it had worked oppressively, and in the law as it now stood there were, in his opinion, certain defects. For example, he thought nothing could be more ludicrous than the present *bonâ fide* traveller clause. There were provisions of that kind in the existing law, as applied to country parts, which should be amended, but as applied to the country parts it had been fairly satisfactory, and he knew no large body of opinion in Ireland in favour of its repeal. So far with regard to the country districts. This Bill did not propose to alter that in the slightest degree, but in the large cities of Ireland the case had been different. In the five large cities the law was that the public-houses were open from two till seven; and the present proposal was that they should be closed for the entire day. He always had been a pronounced supporter of the principle of Sunday Closing, but he was not prepared to say that the application of that principle should be the same in different classes of communities, and he was not clear that it would be practical or wise to have absolute closing for the whole of Sunday in these large cities. He did not know whether the present hours were too long. Possibly a strong case might be made out in that direction, but he submitted that if the case for shortening these hours by one hour or more was to be made out it should be made out before the Royal Commission which was now sitting, and this Bill should be postponed until that Commission had reported. His own individual view was that total Sunday closing in great communities was impracticable, unworkable, and unwise. As to whether the present hours were too long, that was a thing he would not venture to express an opinion upon in view of the action of the English and Scotch Members. Until the Commission had reported it would be a monstrous thing if they were by their votes to force total Sunday closing on Ireland while the same Commission was about to report on it. It seemed to him that the difficulties of carrying out total Sunday closing in these big cities were enormous, the necessary inconvenience to the public so great, and the dangers arising from the formation of bogus clubs and institutions of that kind were so formidable, that it would be an unwise thing to force the Second Reading of this Bill pending the decision of the Royal Commission. The law as it stood at the present moment, notwithstanding certain defects he had mentioned, was fairly satisfactory. Why could not it be allowed to continue for the next year until this Commission had reported. There was only one other observation he desired to make on this matter. He took his stand on the position taken in the House by Mr. Parnell in 1888. On this question, as no doubt on every Irish question that had cropped up since his death, or was likely to crop up in their lifetime, Mr. Parnell's words could be wisely taken as a guide for Irish Nationalist Members to follow. Everyone who knew Mr. Parnell knew he was a strenuous advocate of temperance legislation, quite as strong as the hon. Gentleman who moved this Bill. He, at the commencement of this controversy, voted repeatedly in favour of this Bill. He himself did also, as the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork had reminded him. But in the year 1888 Mr. Parnell, speaking on this subject, laid it down that this was a matter which clearly should be decided by Irish public opinion. The right hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for Montrose, spoke as if Irish public opinion was unanimous in favour of this Bill. On the merits of Sunday closing, probably there was a strong feeling of a large majority of the people in favour of it, but on the question of the passing of this Bill in its present shape at this moment, pending the sitting of the Royal Commission, he ventured to assert there was no such unanimity; but, on the contrary, a majority the other way. He thought it would be found by the House that a considerable majority of the Irish Members in the coming Division would be found voting against the Second Reading; and he asked again, were Englishmen, having refused to accept a similar Bill for themselves, going to force it on the majority of the Irish representatives to-day? Mr. Parnell took the position that this was a matter that should be decided by Irish public opinion. He said:—

> "It matters not what system you leave the superintendence, management, and direction of this Question to in the future, whether to county boards, or the larger system of autonomy proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for Mid-Lothian. In the hands of such bodies, and under either system, the Question is safe. I believe Irishmen, acting at home, discussing this Question amongst themselves, free from your interference, will decide this Question more advantageously and justly than you can here, and their decision will be attended by much happier and better results for the people. The Question is one which is most intimately connected with the question of self-government."

That was the ground on which he took his stand. He said—leave this to a vote of the Irish Members and let the Irish Members of all sections record their votes. If the majority was in favour of the Bill well and good, but would English Home Rulers, in face of the majority of the Irish Members against the Bill, force the Second Reading of it, when the House of Commons refused, by a large majority, in the case of a similar Bill for England, to do so? He pressed on English, Scotch, and Welsh Members the desirability of letting the Irish Members decide this for themselves, and he impressed on all Irish Members the desirability of taking their stand on the sound and sure National ground laid down by Mr. Parnell in 1888.

SIR J. HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said that, as the representative of one of the largest industrial centres in Ireland, he should give his unqualified support to the Bill. He had listened with great interest to the remarks of the previous speaker whose argument, if it was worth anything, amounted to this: "The Bill is a good Bill; it was formerly a child of my own; I formerly took a great interest in its favour; but in view of the strong remarks of the late Mr. Parnell, I believe the Bill should not be passed at present;" and he gave two reasons for that. First, there was a Commission now sitting; and, second, that in the distance Home Rule would be carried; and that, therefore, the Bill would be carried under a Home Rule Government. He was afraid that if Ireland was to be dealt with in that way, they had not listened carefully to her more potent demands made very recently. He knew as much of the city of Belfast as anyone could be expected to do who had lived in it all his life, mixed with its industrial population from his boyhood, been one of the drudges in life, one who had worked his 16 or 17 hours a day, and knew what compulsory labour was to that extent, and who had a feeling in connection with industrial pursuits that Parliament should protect them against inordinate hours, whether for the buyer or the seller. They had curtailed the hours in almost every pursuit in life. By the ringing of the bell they compelled the silence of the engine, the loom, and the shuttle, but the pursuit they were now dealing with they left untouched, and practically admitted amongst them slavery of the deepest and darkest kind to a very large number, not only of employers, but employed. It might be said that Sunday closing or Sunday opening was a voluntary act, that a publican was not obliged to open his public house. But anybody in business knew how fallacious that argument was. A publican's customers would tell him, "If you do not give me my drink on Sunday you shall not give it me on Monday." Therefore he must open his public house if his neighbours kept open. He had among some of his most esteemed friends men in the liquor traffic in Belfast, and he knew that a considerable proportion of them would welcome the Bill as relieving them of the necessity of opening, and as protecting them against the competition of their neighbours. There were three or four principles which appeared to operate in the minds of hon. Members who opposed the Bill, with which he would try to deal. The first was bogus clubs. He did not know that they could ever do away with bogus clubs until they did away with drinkers altogether. He did not know what was meant by bogus clubs unless it was a hairdresser's, where they could get a shave nominally for a penny and had fourpence added to the shave for a wash and grog. There were innumerable ways in which a drinking man could get drink, and he did not suppose they would be able to stop it. But bogus clubs had not prospered in Belfast. It might be said that the reason was that they had Sunday opening. But the hardest time of all for a drinking man was in the morning; if he could do until Two o'clock in the day without a drink, he could do without it all day, but he wanted a hair of the dog that bit him very early indeed, lest hydrophobia should set in. As to the argument that Sunday closing would lead to drinking at home, he felt that, unless a man was lost to all feelings of decency, the presence of his children would deter him from drinking. He believed in the Irish character, because they drank less at a time. In England they were not in it with Ireland. [*Laughter.*] He sometimes did go into a public house. [*Laughter, cries of* "Oh!" *and a* NATIONALIST MEMBER: "What for?"] Just by way of observation. [*Renewed laughter.*] He was astonished to find an hon. Member opposing the Bill who was a total abstainer. He was himself a life-long abstainer, never having tasted drink in his life. All his life long he had been trying to lift upwards those who were so deeply sunk—["hear, hear!"]—and if this Bill would do anything, he gave it his support on the highest grounds. In England they were selfish in this matter. They would drink their two pots of beer, and each man would pay for his own. Such a thing in Ireland would put a man out of society. What, then, would an Irishman do. He would go half way up and down the street till he met some chum who would go in and have a drink. [*Laughter.*] He would not go in by himself, but if he had a chum they would have two pots, and if there were four chums they would have four pots. [*Laughter.*] It was the social element which entered into this question in Ireland. Chums did not go into each other's houses to drink in Ireland. If they did, as a rule the thrifty wife would welcome Jones's company by trying to give him a cup of tea or something of that sort. ["Hear, hear!"] There was another argument which had been presented to them. He was not going to use any strong words about the trade. God knows what any of them might have been if they had been raised in the trade themselves. [*Laughter.*] He said that frankly and freely. He was a druggist himself, and there was nothing like taking plenty of drugs. But unfortunately people did not understand that, and they only came to him in their last resource. It might be said that the publican was his best friend. He did his best to break a man down, and then that man came to him (Sir James) to set him up again. He saw in the petition which had been circulated, it was stated that the clergy were in favour of opening on Sundays. That was a bold statement. They were told in the petition that 20,000 names had been got in Belfast against the Bill, and amongst the names he found that of Mr. T. W. Russell. [*Loud laughter.*] He was only trying to show the value of these petitions, and he would content himself by saying that if this one was signed in the public houses there they might expect to find a strong opinion on the subject. ["Hear, hear!"] He was especially interested in the Saturday night question. In Belfast the chief number of arrests was made on Saturday night, and Saturday night drinking was opposed to the highest interests of the working man, as well as to his health and strength. The day of rest was never given to the toiling men that it might be used for sleeping off the debauchery of the previous day. The recognised courts of the Presbyterian Church in Belfast supported the Bill, and they represented more than 17,000 families. The Wesleyans, who represented no inconsiderable portion of the population, this week declared unanimously in favour of a Sunday Closing Act, and the Episcopalians and Roman Catholics took the same view. For the sake of the families of the working men, and for the sake of the principles of humanity, which should be dear to all of them, he beseeched the House not to be led away by the argument that this Bill was an interference with individual liberty, but to take away the temptation to trample under foot God's day of rest.

SIR THOMAS LEA claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.—Debate resumed.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.), said that, as a member of the Licensing Commission, he felt he ought to keep an open mind until the Inquiry was concluded. He suggested to the House that no legislation of this kind should be passed until the Commission had reported, when a comprehensive Measure dealing with the licensing laws could be passed. The present Bill was, after all, nothing but a piecemeal attempt to deal with a part of the question. Ireland had the right to the same treatment as England in this matter. He strongly objected to the extremists and faddists who thrust their opinions upon others with intolerable tyranny. The arguments of the hon. Member who last spoke were really directed to a total abolition of the drink traffic.

*MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) said that the Bill affected two interests. The rural publicans were affected by the early closing on Saturday night, and the publicans in the big towns were affected by the Sunday closing. It was in the interests of the former that he should speak. As to the arguments derived from the evils of the drink traffic, they would be more properly directed to a Bill for the total abolition of the traffic than to the Measure before the House. Many of the speakers had held up the publican as a sort of vulture preying upon society, whose extirpation should be the first work of Parliament; but really the whole question was one of free-will. The publican did not drag men into his house; his customers went there of their own accord. Of course those who opposed this Bill were subjected to all sorts of misrepresentation; and there had been much virtuous declamation on the part of the promoters of the Bill against the heinousness of any Member daring to defend the trade in which he was in any degree interested. But what had the lawyers done on the previous evening, when one of their grievances was before the House? They saw the lawyers of all sides and parties gather in self defence and support the Motion before it. Much had been said too about the issuing of whips by the opponents of this Bill, as though it were not the constant and legitimate practice of those interested in any question to issue Whips when a division was to be taken by the House. When had there been any Bill affecting lawyers, doctors, engineers, or any trade or interest that the persons affected had not canvassed the House? At present, in all Irish towns below 6,000 in population, the public houses were open from 7 in the morning to 10 at night; and it should be remembered that in Ireland every publican was a grocer. His experience was that for five days in the week those hours were too long. He said that, not from a temperance point of view, but because the trade in the Irish towns was declining. The one day in the week on which the publican had any business to do in the rural districts of Ireland was Saturday. His customers were the farmers and labourers. The farmers came into town early and left early; and he repudiated the charge of heavy drinking which had been brought against them. The habit had very sensibly declined. But the labourers of Ireland could not get away from their work until the end of the day. There was no Saturday half-holiday for Irish labourers. Their employers were generally men who took twelve long hours of toil out of them whether the day was Monday or Saturday. Then when his day's work was done, perhaps, the labourer had to go two or three miles to the nearest town to do his marketing, and to compel the closing of public-houses at nine o'clock, and thus prevent the man from getting the necessaries of life, was an entire invasion of the liberty and right which he enjoyed under the existing law. He absolutely denied the statement that public opinion in Ireland was unanimous in favour of the Bill. No public meeting had ever been held in Ireland in favour of the Bill; at no election in Ireland had this question been made a test question. The Mover of the Second Reading of the Bill had stated that one thousand clergy were in favour of its principles. As there were 5,000 clergy of all denominations in Ireland, one thousand was not a preponderating number in favour of the principles of the Bill. This was a most important question, and deserved more serious consideration than could be given to it in a few hours on a Wednesday afternoon. The Government had appointed a Royal Commission to report to the House what steps should be taken to regulate the whole traffic in drink. Therefore, the position taken up by the First Lord of the Treasury, in supporting the Bill, was most inconsistent, and the hon. Member for Waterford was well entitled to complain that in all these matters one line was taken in regard to England and another and a totally different line was taken in regard to Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.—Debate resumed.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Govan) supported the Bill. He came from a country where Sunday closing had been in operation for 50 years, and the results had been so satisfactory that no hon. Member from Scotland would, in the interests of his constituents, ask that it should be repealed or abrogated in any way. ["Hear, hear!"] When the Sunday Closing Bill for Scotland was before the House it was said—as it was said now in regard to Ireland—that it would lead to a disturbance of the public peace. The result in Scotland was the very reverse. ["Hear, hear!"] The Sunday in Scotland was a quiet, peaceable day; whereas formerly, when the public-houses were opened, there was a great deal of drunkenness and immorality. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped, therefore, that the result of the division would be in favour of the establishment of Sunday closing in Ireland.

Mr. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) said he was surprised that a Scotch Home Ruler like his Friend the Member for Govan should have taken part in the Debate at all. [*Laughter.*] His hon. Friend believed that Ireland should have control of her own affairs; therefore, his interference was a contradiction of his principles. [*Laughter.*] He ventured to assert, in reply to his hon. Friend's remarks on the effect of Sunday closing in Scotland, that there was less drunkenness and more virtue in the city of Dublin or in any part of Ireland than in any city in Scotland, with all its Sunday closing. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He was astonished that the Bill should have been introduced by the hon. Member for Dublin University. The hon. Gentleman must have forgotten some of his arguments in his latest book, "Democracy and Liberty." In that book, referring to the proposal for the total or partial prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors, by local option or by general enactment, he said it was an argument for preventing all men from using drink because some used it to excess. The hon. Gentleman then went on to say that such coercion must not be confounded with that which was sometimes found necessary in industrial life for the purposes of carrying out the wishes of a majority. If the great majority of shopkeepers desired to shut their shops on a particular day, or if the great majority of workmen wished to leave the factory at a particular hour, they might plausibly argue that the rule should be made universal, as a minority pursuing a different course would frustrate their desires. But, he said, the man who wished to go to a public house did not in any way interfere with the liberty of those who desired to abstain. [*Laughter.*] In practice, too, the restriction was a measure of extreme partiality. ["Hear, hear!"] The rich man had his private cellar and his club, whereas the poor man had not. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. LECKY said that in the passage quoted he was speaking of local option, and not of Sunday closing, and the hon. Member would find that two pages further on he had said that in his opinion public opinion both in Ireland and in Scotland was unquestionably in favour of Sunday closing.

Mr. CLANCY said the words "partial or total prohibition" occurred. Moreover, this passage was founded upon an assumption which the hon. Gentleman took for granted—namely, that the majority of the Irish people were in favour of such legislation as this. That was not the case. The hon. Member for Trinity College had recently defended the right of the landlords to compensation, but now he proposed to take away the income of the publicans without offering them any compensation. To his mind this would be an act of pure confiscation, and he hoped that English Home Rulers would not go into the Lobby in favour of this Bill when they knew that the majority of the Irish Members did not approve of it.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) thought it was a mistake to say that the majority of the Irish Members would be found voting against this Bill. This was a question between whisky-makers and publicans on the one side, and the great majority of the Irish people on the other. [*Cheers and cries of* "No!"] He represented a constituency mainly composed of working men, and he did not know of any question which had come recently before the House which had had such unanimous approval from his constituents. He had had many letters and petitions in favour of the Bill, and he believed that if the constituencies were polled a great majority of the Irish people would be found to be in its favour. It had been tried in Scotland, and had been eminently successful in Glasgow. [*Laughter and cries of* "No!"] It had been successful at any rate so far as the Irish population of Glasgow was concerned—the Scotch population, he believed, were perfectly incorrigible in the direction of whisky. [*Laughter.*] He believed the overwhelming opinion of all ministers and religious denominations in Ireland was in favour of this Bill, which would put down what had been found to be an intolerable nuisance and evil in Ireland, and he hoped the Government would see that it had a fair chance of passing into law this Session.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny), in opposing the Bill, urged that, in order to be consistent, the Government should at least wait until they had further information on the subject before they legislated. That would be following the course they had adopted in regard to the question of the financial relations. Let them put their own House in order before legislating for Ireland on this matter. That House was either a shebeen or a bogus club. Hon. Gentlemen did not practise what they preached, for of the ten Gentlemen whose names were on the back of the Bill, five, at least, did not practise abstention from intoxicants. He should vote for the rejection of the Bill, but if it passed the Second Reading, they would oppose it at every stage.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 201; Noes, 172.—(Division List—No. 206—appended.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Rt. Hon. A. H. Dyke
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allen, Wm. (Newc. under Lyme
Allison, Robert Andrew
Anstruther, H. T.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Baird, John George Alexander
Baker, Sir John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. J. Blair (Clackm)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Begg, Ferdinand Faithful
Bethell, Commander
Biddulph, Michael
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, Alexander H.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell, James A.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carmichael, Sir T. D. Gibson-
Carson, Edward
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.)
Clough, Walter Owen
Colville, John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.
Cozens-Hardy, Herbert Hardy
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Currie, Sir Donald
Curzon, Rt. Hn. G. N. (Lanc. S. W
Dalziel, James Henry
Dane, Richard M.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Denny, Colonel
Donkin, Richard Sim
Doughty, George
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, Thos. Edw. (Merionethsh.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir H. (Wol'tn)
Gourley, Sir Edwd. Temperley
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Harrison, Charles
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Havelock-Allan, General Sir H.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Healy, Thomas J. (Wexford)
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down)
Hobhouse, Henry
Hogan, James Francis
Holburn, J. G.
Holden, Angus

Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Joseph
Hubbard, Hon. Evelyn
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Joicey, Sir James
Jolliffe, Hon. H. George
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn. Sir U.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenrick, William
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Lees
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land)
Lecky, William Edward H.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Leuty, Thomas Richmond
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans'a)
Lloyd-George, David
Lockwood, Sir Frank (York)
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Sir Leonard
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
McArthur, William
McCalmont, Maj-Gen (Ant'm N.)
McCalmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
McGhee, Richard
McKillop, James
Maclaren, Charles Benjamin
McLeod, John
Maden, John Henry
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J.W. (Yorks.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milward, Colonel Victor
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel)
Morgan, Rt. Hn. Sir G.O. (Denbs)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)
Mundella, Rt. Hn. Anthony John
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Owen, Thomas
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Arthur (Darlington)
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Plunkett, Hon. Horace Curzon
Priestley, Briggs (Yorks.)
Priestley, Sir W. Overend (Edin.)
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Saunderson, Col. Edw. James
Savory, Sir Joseph
Schwann, Charles E.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. McTaggart
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorburn, Walter
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert (Perth)
Walton, John Lawson
Waring, Col. Thomas
Wayman, Thomas
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, J. W. (Worc'sh., N.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodall, William
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudrsfld.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Mr. Maurice Healy and Sir Thomas Lea.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold, Alfred
Ascroft, Robert
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baden-Powell, Sir Geo. Smyth
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, A. H. Smith- (Hunts.)
Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
Bass, Hamar
Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants.)
Bhownaggree, M. M.
Bigwood, James
Boulnois, Edmund
Bucknill, Thomas Townsend
Carew, James Laurence
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Chaloner, Captain R. G. W.
Charrington, Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, Sir Edw. (Plymouth)
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne (Beds.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd.)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
Cox, Robert
Crilly, Daniel
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Curzon, Viscount (Bucks.)
Dalbiac, Major Philip Hugh
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Daly, James
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Drage, Geoffrey
Drucker, A.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Gen. Sir James Bevan
Evershed, Sydney
Fardell, Thomas George
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Field, William (Dublin)
Fielden, Thomas
Finch, George H.
Finch-Hatton, Hon. Harold H.
Fison, Frederick William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Ernest
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Godson, Augustus Frederick
Gold, Charles
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Gunter, Colonel
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hn. A. Staveley (Staffs.)
Hill, Sir Edw. Stock (Bristol)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Samuel (Norwich)
Howell, William Tudor
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hunt, Sir Frederick Seager
Hutchinson, Capt. G.W. Grice-
Isaacson, Frederick Wootton

Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, John H. (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Legh, Hon. Thomas W. (Lanc.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewellyn, Evan H. (Somerset)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverpool)
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lorne, Marquess of
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macaleese, Daniel
Maclure, John William
McCalmont, H. L. B. (Cambs.)
McDermott, Patrick
M'Hugh, E. (Armagh, S.)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milbank, Powlett Charles John
Milner, Sir Frederick George
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robert Jasper
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Northcote, Hon. Sir H. Stafford
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Capt. Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Robinson, Brooke
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sheehy, David
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stanley, Henry M. (Lambeth)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Usborne, Thomas
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Sir William Hood
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

Tellers for the Noes, Mr. Harrington and Mr. Duncombe.

Main Question put, and agreed to.—Bill read a Second time, and committed for To-morrow.

LAND VALUES (TOWNS) ASSESSMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 14th July.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY FOR INJURIES TO WORKMEN BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

CORN SALES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

ACCOUNTANTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

TROUT FISHING CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

UNLAWFUL POSSESSION BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [29th January] further adjourned till Wednesday 16th June.

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 25th May.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

ACCOUNTANTS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

BUILDING FEUS AND LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

BOILER INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 24th May.

BOROUGH FUNDS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 27th May.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 26th May.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNTY COUNCIL CLERKS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 26th May.

POLICE PENSIONS AND SERVICE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Friday.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

CHAFF-CUTTING MACHINES ACCIDENTS BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged.—Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

As amended, considered; to be Read the Third time To-morrow.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till Tuesday next.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MOTIONS.

COLONIAL SOLICITORS.

Bill to provide for the admission of Solicitors of Courts of British Possessions to the Supreme Courts in the United Kingdom, ordered to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollit and Mr. Hogan; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 244.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Local Government Act 1888, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bigwood and Mr. Howard; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 245.]

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes before Six o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 13th May 1897.

COPYRIGHT (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.],

A Bill to amend the law relating to copyright in periodical works, lectures, abridgements, and otherwise—Was presented by the Lord Monskswell; Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 79.]

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of ONSLOW) moved the Second Reading of the East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill, the object of which is to set at rest certain doubts which have arisen as to the powers of the Secretary of State with regard to officers who were originally upon the establishment of the East India Company, and have now, under the Act of Parliament, been transferred to the control of the Secretary of State for India in Council. There were, he said, only 12 of them still in the service.

Read 2ª (according to Order); and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUNDS BILL.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW, in moving the Second Reading of the Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill, said this, again, was a Bill to set at rest certain legal doubts respecting the vesting in the Secretary of State the surplus funds belonging to this institution. By actuarial calculation it had been discovered that the assets were considerably in excess of the liabilities, and as the object of the fund would in the course of a very short time come to an end, it was deemed advisable that whatever might be left over should be vested in the Secretary of State in Council instead of in the hands of trustees who were under legal disability from transferring them to any other person.

Read 2ª (according to Order); and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL [H.L.],

Considered in Committee (according to Order).

[The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES, The Earl of MORLEY, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

SHORT TITLE.

1. This Act may be cited as the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2,—

PERSONS RETAINING OR RECEIVING FOR HIRE INFANTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAINTENANCE TO GIVE NOTICE THEREOF.

(1.) Any person retaining or receiving for hire or reward in that behalf more than one infant under the age of five years for the purpose of nursing or maintaining such infants apart from their parents for a longer period than forty-eight hours, shall within the said forty-eight hours give notice thereof to the local authority.

(2.) Such notice shall truly state the name, age, and sex of such infants, the name of the person receiving the infants, and the dwelling within which such infants are being kept, and the name and address of the person or persons from whom the infants have been received.

(3.) If any such infant is removed from the care of the person who has received the infant for the purpose aforesaid, such person shall forthwith give to the local authority notice of the removal, and of the name and address of the person to whose care the infant has been transferred.

(4.) If any person who has retained or received any infant as aforesaid omits to give the said notices, or any of them, or knowingly or wilfully makes or causes or procures any other person to make any false statement in any such offence, he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3,—

APPOINTMENT AND POWERS OF INSPECTORS, ETC.

(1.) It shall be the duty of every local authority to provide for the execution of this Act within its district, and for that purpose it may appoint male or female inspectors, paid or unpaid, and may appoint or authorise in writing other suitable persons to execute the provisions of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as may be stated in such appointment or authorisation.

(2.) Any local authority may combine with any other local authority for the purpose of executing the provisions of this Act, and for defraying the expenses of such execution.

(3.) Any inspector or other person duly appointed and authorised in writing by or on behalf of the local authority shall from time to time inspect any infants referred to in any notice given under this Act, and the premises in which they are retained or received, in order to satisfy himself as to the proper maintenance of such infants or to give any necessary advice or directions as to such maintenance.

(4.) If any person retaining or receiving such infants refuses to allow any such inspector or other person to inspect such infants or the premises in which they are retained or received he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

(5.) If any such inspector or other person is refused admittance to any premises in contravention of this Act, or has reason to believe that any infants under the age of five years are being kept in any house or premises in contravention of this Act, he may apply to any justice of the peace, who, on being satisfied that there is reasonable ground for believing that an offence against this Act has been committed, may grant a warrant authorising such inspector or other person to enter the house or premises for the purpose of inspection or of ascertaining whether any offence against this Act has been committed, and if the occupier of the house or premises or other person obstruct any inspector or other person acting in pursuance of such warrant, he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

LORD BELPER said he had two or three Amendments to move on behalf of the Home Secretary. They were as follows:—

Sub-section (1), after the word "district," to insert the words:—

"and for that purpose it shall from time to time make inquiry whether there are any persons residing therein who retain or receive infants for hire or reward within the provisions of the preceding section."

Sub-section (1), to leave out the words "and may," and to insert instead thereof the words:—

"(2.) A local authority may, if it think fit, appoint male or female inspectors to enforce this Act, and, if any such persons as aforesaid are found in its district, it shall either appoint such inspectors or arrange for the infants being visited by ladies nominated by the local authority and authorised by it in writing to enforce the provisions of this Act.

"(3.) A local authority may also, if it think fit."

The object of these Amendments was to make the Bill more effectual for its purpose than the Act at present in force had proved to be, and also to make it enforceable, particularly in the country districts, without throwing unreasonable expense on the local authority. According to evidence given before the Select Committee, and also returns made to the Home Office, the present Act was really a dead letter in a very large number of places, although it was very efficiently carried out by the London County Council and in one or two other large towns. As the Bill stood, the onus was thrown on the person who takes in more than one child for hire or reward to give notice of the fact to the local authority, and he was afraid that in many cases the local authority, if they did not receive such notice, would practically do nothing. Accordingly, he proposed to lay it down as a distinct obligation on the local authority that it "should from time to time make inquiry." Under the Bill as it stood, moreover, there was no absolute obligation on the local authority to appoint inspectors, and he proposed that, where it was found there were houses where children were kept, in that case steps should be taken to provide proper inspection either "by appointing inspectors or arranging for the infants being visited by ladies nominated by the local authority, and authorised by it in writing to enforce the provisions of this Act." He believed that Boards of Guardians who had visiting committees would have no difficulty in asking such ladies to visit the houses, and make an inspection if necessary.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH thought the Amendments moved on behalf of the Home Office were calculated to make the Act more efficacious, and would do away with the reproach which had up to now been very justly levelled against the local authorities in connection with the present law.

Several Amendments mentioned agreed to; Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 4,—

NUMBER OF INFANTS RETAINED.

It shall be the duty of the local authority to fix the number of infants under the age of five years which may be retained or received in any dwelling in respect of which notice has been received under the Act, and any person retaining or receiving any infant in excess of the number so fixed shall be guilty of an offence against the Act.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5,—

PUBLICATION OF ACT.

It shall be the duty of the local authority to give public notice of the provisions of this Act, by the publication of an abstract thereof or otherwise as a Secretary of State may direct.

Clause 6,—

REMOVAL OF INFANT IMPROPERLY KEPT.

(1.) Should any infant, in respect of which notice is required to be given under this Act,—

(*a*) be kept in any house or premises which are so unfit as to endanger its health; or

(*b*) be retained or received by any person who, by reason of negligence, ignorance, or other cause, is so unfit to have its care and maintenance as to endanger its health;

any inspector or other person appointed for the purposes of this Act may apply to the local authority for an order in writing directing him to remove such infant to a workhouse or place of safety until it can be restored to its relatives or guardians or be otherwise lawfully disposed of.

(2.) Any person refusing to comply with an order under this section upon the same being produced and read over to him, or obstructing the inspector or other authorised person in the execution thereof, shall be guilty of an offence under this Act, and the inspector may apply to any justice of the peace for an order directing the removal of the child, and such order may be enforced by any police constable.

(3.) The master of any workhouse shall receive into the workhouse any child brought there under such order, and such child shall be maintained in the workhouse until it can be otherwise disposed of.

(4.) Infants shall not be retained or received for hire or reward by any person from whose care any infant has been removed under this section, unless with the sanction in writing of the local authority.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved, in paragraph (a), Sub-section (1), after the word "unfit" to insert the words "or so overcrowded." He moved them, he said, as an additional protection to children, and in deference to urgent representations he had received from people interested in the question, and more especially from various medical authorities.

Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved, in Sub-section (4), to leave out the words "Infants shall not," and to insert the words, "No infant shall." He explained that this was a drafting Amendment, intended to make it clear that no person who had been convicted of cruelty to children should be allowed to keep even one child for hire or reward.

Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved the following consequential Amendments:—

Sub-section (4) after the word "section" to insert the words:—

"or by any person convicted of any offence under the Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Acts."

Sub-section (4) after the word "authority" to insert the words:—

"and any person retaining or receiving any infant contrary to this section shall be guilty of an offence against this Act."

Amendments agreed to; Clause as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 7,—

NOTICE TO CORONER.

In case of the death of any infant respecting whom notice is required under this Act, the person having the care of such infant shall, within twenty-four hours of such death cause notice thereof to be given to the coroner of the district within which the body of such infant lies, and the coroner shall hold an inquest thereon unless a certificate under the hand of a registered medical practitioner shall be produced to him, certifying that such registered medical practitioner has personally attended or examined such infant, and specifying the cause of its death, and the coroner shall be satisfied by such certificate that there is no ground for holding such inquest. If the person having the care of such infant shall neglect to give the notice in this section mentioned he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 8,—

PENALTIES.

Every person guilty of an offence under this Act shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £5, or to imprisonment for not more than six months, as a court of summary jurisdiction may award.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 9,—

EXPENSES.

All expenses incurred by or on behalf of the local authority in and about the execution of this Act shall be defrayed out of the local rate.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 10,—

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES.

Any offence under this Act may be prosecuted before a court of summary jurisdiction in manner provided by the Summary Jurisdiction Acts.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 11,—

APPLICATION OF FINES.

Any moneys arising from penalties under this Act shall, notwithstanding any provision in any other Act, be paid to the local authority, and be applied to the purposes to which the local rate is applicable."

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 12,—

NOTICES.

Every notice by this Act required to be given to the local authority shall be in writing, and shall be sent by post as a registered letter to the clerk of the local authority, or to such other person as the local authority may appoint, or be delivered at the office of the local authority.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 13,—

EXEMPTIONS.

The provisions of this Act shall not extend to the relatives or guardians of any infant by them retained or received as aforesaid; or to any person receiving any infant for the purpose of nursing or maintaining such infant under the provisions of any Act for the relief of the poor or of any order of the Local Government Board made under such Act; or to hospitals; convalescent homes or institutions established for the protection and care of infants and conducted in good faith for religious or charitable purposes.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 14,—

DEFINITION.

The terms "local rate," "local jurisdiction," and "local authority," mean in reference to the districts mentioned in the first column of the schedule to this Act, the rate, jurisdiction, and authority mentioned in the second, third, and fourth columns of the said schedule, and such schedule shall be deemed to be part of this Act. The term "place of safety" shall mean any suitable place, the occupier of which is willing temporarily to receive such infant. The term "relatives" shall mean and include the parents, grandparents, and uncles, and aunts by consanguinity or affinity of the infant retained or received as aforesaid, and in the case of illegitimate infants the persons who would be so related if the infant were legitimate.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 15,—

APPLICATION TO SCOTLAND.

This Act in its application to Scotland shall be subject to the following provision: The sheriff shall be substituted for a justice of the peace; the procurator fiscal shall be substituted for the coroner, and an inquiry by him into the cause of death for an inquest; and poorhouse shall be substituted for workhouse.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH, in deference to the wishes of the Irish Office, moved to insert the following new clause. After Clause 15,—

APPLICATION TO IRELAND.

"In the application of this Act to Ireland, the Chief Secretary shall be substituted for a Secretary of State, and the Local Government Board for Ireland shall be substituted for the Local Government Board."

Clause Read a First and Second time, and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 16,—

REPEAL.

The Infant Life Protection Act 1872, shall be repealed from the date of the commencement of this Act.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 17,—

COMMENCEMENT OF ACT.

This Act shall commence on the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

THE SCHEDULE REFERRED TO IN THE FOREGOING ACT.

ENGLAND AND WALES.

District.	Local Rate.	Local Jurisdiction.	Local Authority.
County of London . .	Rate or fund applicable to the payment of the general expenses of the Council	Area of the County of London (except the City of London)	London County Council.
City of London . .	Consolidated sewers rate	Area of the City of London and the liberties thereof	Common Council.
Boroughs	The borough fund or borough rate	Area of borough . .	Council.
Other places . . .	The district rate . .	District of the district council	The district council.

SCOTLAND.

District.	Local Rate.	Local Jurisdiction.	Local Authority.
Counties	The county general assessment	Area subject to the county general assessment	Justice of peace.
Burghs, Royal or Parliamentary, not subject to the separate jurisdiction of police commissioners or trustees	The revenue or common good of the burgh or any rate leviable by the town council	Area of the burgh .	Town council.
Burghs and places where police commissioners or trustees exercise the functions of police commissioners or trustees under any general or local Act	Any rate leviable by the commissioners or trustees, or any fund belonging to them	Area within the boundaries of the burgh or place as defined under the general or local Act	The commissioners or trustees.

IRELAND.

District.	Local Rate.	Local Jurisdiction.	Local Authority.
Towns corporate . .	The borough rate or borough fund	Area of borough . .	Town council.
Towns having commissioners appointed by virtue of an Act made in the ninth year of the reign of George the Fourth, intituled : "An Act to make provision for the lighting, cleansing, and watching of cities and towns corporate and market towns in Ireland in certain cases"	Any rate leviable by the Commissioners .	Area of town . .	The commissioners.
Towns having town commissioners under the Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 103), or under any other local Act		Area of town . .	The commissioners.
Townships having commissioners under local Acts		Area of township .	The commissioners.
Places in Ireland not included in the foregoing descriptions	The grand jury cess .	Area of petty sessional district in which the place is situate	The petty sessions for the district in which the place is situate.

LORD BELPER moved the following Amendment :—

Schedule (England and Wales), to leave out lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, and to insert :—

"Other places.	The poor rate.
The poor law union.	The board of guardians."

He said that the effect of the Amendment was to substitute the Board of Guardians as the authority for the Borough or District Council. He pointed out that the duties of the District Council were not similar to those imposed by the Bill ; and the Home Office and the Local Government Board were both fully agreed that it would be better to intrust the duties to the Boards of Guardians. Those bodies had in the relieving officer a suitable person to make the necessary inquiries ; and they would be more in touch with the persons employed for inspecting houses. Further, the Boards of Guardians had already certain duties under the Bill in respect of children in a house certified to be an unfit place for keeping them.

Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved the following Amendment :—Schedule (Ireland), to leave out from the end of line 2 to the end of the schedule, and to insert instead thereof :—

"In all places.	The poor rate.
The poor law union.	The board of guardians."

He said that it was similar to the Amendment which had just been agreed to, and simply carried out the wishes of the Irish Office.

Amendment agreed to; Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended.—[No. 80.]

CONVEYANCING BILL [H.L.],

*LORD DAVEY, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said that it was to simplify the titles to real estate, and also, in order to achieve that end, to assimilate the settlement of real estate to the settlement of personal estate. One of the chief causes of complexity of title, and of the consequent expense of purchasing real estate, was the great number of interests capable of being created as legal interests, and involving proof of births and deaths. All these questions had to be inquired into by any one purchasing real estate; and no purchaser could be advised to complete until it was certain that all the interests had been disposed of. In personal estate the case was different. If a man wished to settle stocks and shares, all he did was to vest them in trustees, who were registered, and the legal title then passed from hand to hand without any inquiry as to the equitable interests attached to the legal ownership of the trustees. The Bill proposed to make all the interests which could be at present created in real estate by settlement equitable interests, so that there would always be a succession of legal owners; and purchasers would not be bound to see to the disposition of the equitable ownership, and would be concerned only with the legal owner who had power to deal with the estate. In that way much of the complexity and expense would be done away with. It was not intended to interfere at all with the present power of settling estates; but the Bill provided that settlements should take effect only by way of equitable interest, capable of being enforced against the trustee, but having no effect on the purchaser who had obtained his title from the legal owner. The way in which this was done was by an adaptation of the machinery of the Settled Land Acts, known as Lord Cairns' Act. Under that Act the tenant for life had power to dispose of the fee simple of an estate, subject to the consent of certain trustees who were appointed trustees for the purposes of the settlement. He was under no restrictions, except that he must sell the fee simple for the best price that could reasonably be obtained, and no person entitled in remainder had any right to interfere with his disposition of the estate. There had now been some years' experience of that procedure, and it could be said to have worked well and with safety to those who were interested in real estate, while, on the other hand, it had been a great boon to many persons by enabling real estate to be disposed of in a way that was not before possible. What the Bill proposed was to convert the legal tenant for life, who had the power of disposition over the fee, into an owner in fee—to make the legal tenant for life own the fee over which he already had the power of disposition, but in trust for himself and the others persons entitled. The Bill was drawn so as to be applicable to existing settlements and to those which might be made hereafter. By the ownership of the fee being given to the tenant for life the trouble of obtaining trustees and the difficulty of dual ownership through trustees would be done away with. Upon the death of the tenant for life it was proposed that the estate should vest in his real representative. The Bill contained provisions for the appointment of a real representative, who would normally be the executor or administrator. In that way a succession of legal ownership would be secured, and the purchaser need no more trouble himself about any of the complicated interests involved than need the purchaser of railway stock. There was one clause of the Bill which it was probable their Lordships in Committee might consider one that ought not to be sanctioned by the House. That was the clause providing that Succession Duty and Estate Duty should be a charge on the estate owner, and not on the estate. But he was informed that there was nothing that created greater trouble and difficulty in dealing with the purchase of estates than the charges in respect of Estate Duty and Succession Duty being placed on the estate. The scheme of the Bill was not inconsistent with the Registration of the Title Bill of the present Session. Indeed, it would facilitate the work of registration contemplated by that Measure. The Bill had the support of the representative body of the solicitors, the Incorporated Law Society. It introduced no novelty in principle, while on the other hand it rendered much technical and complicated law obsolete as regarded both purchasers and mortgagees. He was quite conscious that the Bill would require careful consideration in Committee, when, no doubt, improvements would be suggested in its machinery which would greatly facilitate its working.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said the Bill was something in the nature of a new departure. He did not think the House ought to refuse to accept the Second Reading; but, at the same time, the Bill would, as the noble Lord who introduced it had frankly admitted, require careful consideration. He would, therefore, support the Second Reading, without expressing any absolute concurrence with this new scheme, subject to the arrangement that it should be referred for consideration to a Select Committee.

*LORD DAVEY said he had no objection to that course being taken.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and referred to a Select Committee.

ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order), Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be Read 3ª To-morrow.

NAVY AND MARINES (WILLS) ACT (1865) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order), Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be Read 3ª on Monday next.

Lord Davey.

TRUSTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

PROVISIONAL ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR) rose to call attention to the present system of private Bill legislation as affecting Scotland, and to present a Bill. He said he need not go at any length into the history of the system of private Bill legislation, because its principle was as well known to the great majority of their Lordships as it was to himself. But he might mention that the system as now known only dated from 1837. Prior to that time the House of Lords, like the House of Commons, carried its private Bill legislation through open Committees of the whole House. It was in 1837 that this House adopted the system of appointing Select Committees constituted of Members of the House who had no interest in the subject of the Bill. The same course was followed by the House of Commons seven years later in the case of railway Bills, but it was not until 1855 that all opposed private Bills were remitted to Select Committees in the House of Commons. Since that time attempts had been made at intervals in both Houses to reform the system. These efforts at reform had proceeded on two main lines. It had either been proposed that the private Bill should originate in Parliament, as at present, and that the Committee stage should be taken before some outside permanent tribuanl, or else that the whole system of private Bill legislation should be referred to some such outside tribunal, and that the completed schemes only should come before Parliament for confirmation. The main object of every one of those proposals had been to relieve Parliament of the inconvenience and of the call upon the time of Members which was necessary for the due consideration of private Bills in the Committee stage. In 1869 it was suggested that this object should be attained by referring all private Bills to a Joint Committee of both Houses, instead of to a Select Committee of each House in turn, but that proposal did not at that time meet with much favour. In 1872 a series of Resolutions were proposed in the House of Commons by Lord Monk Bretton, then Mr. Dodson, which had for their object to test the opinion of the House upon the system which would be involved in the setting up of a permanent tribunal of judicial persons for the consideration of private Bills. A very long discussion ensued, and the proposal was a good deal criticised, mainly upon the same ground that he thought would be advanced against it at the present time—namely, that such a tribunal would become tied by its own precedents, and that it would not yield to the varying desires of public opinion with sufficient rapidity. The Government of that day accepted a Resolution, which was unanimously carried, that the system of private Bill legislation called for the attention of Parliament and required reform. Following upon that, the proposal for a reform of private Bill legislation was taken up by the late Mr. Craig-Sellar, who introduced Bills in the House of Commons in the years 1885, 1886, and 1887. In none of those years, however, was a Bill fortunate enough to obtain its Second Reading. In 1888 a Joint Committee of both Houses was appointed, of which he had the honour to be a member, and the terms of reference instructed them to report how the system could be modified in the interests of suitors, of the economy of the time of Parliament, and of the reduction of costs and charges. A Report was presented, not unanimously, but by a majority of that Committee, with the object of constituting, not a wholly permanent tribunal, but one which differed from the tribunals which they now had for the consideration of the Committee stage of private Bills. Of course, the reference to that Committee was in regard to the whole system of private Bill legislation for the United Kingdom. In 1889 the Government of the day tried to introduce a reform, so far as Scotland was concerned, as a part of their scheme of local government for that country, but that part of the scheme was dropped, and it did not receive the assent of either House of Parliament. In 1890, 1891, and again in 1892, Bills were proposed by the Government, and in one case a Second Reading was obtained, and the Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the House of Commons. It was, however, a good deal altered by the Committee, and was not proceeded with. It was not too much to say, he thought, that every one of these attempts at reform of the system had failed either upon the question of the tribunal to which the Committee stage of Bills should be referred, upon the question of procedure, or upon the difficulty of defining to what Bills the new procedure should be applied. It was obvious that in the case of railway Bills it was not easy to find a definition which should be applicable to all cases. A small branch railway in Scotland was in all probability a purely local concern, but, if an attempt were made to amalgamate two of the large Scottish railways, it was quite clear that that was not only a Scottish question, but one which affected great English interests, and which should therefore be reserved for the consideration of Parliament. Then there was a class of Bills dealing with banking, insurance, and other companies; and, as the company law of the two countries was almost identical, it would be very inconvenient if new principles were established for one country which were not shared in by the other. It was very important that that class of Bills should not be withdrawn from real examination in Parliament. The need for some alteration in the present system was, however, really urgent, and it arose from two somewhat different causes—first, on account of the increasing dislike of Members of both Houses to the growing demands made upon their time; and, secondly, for local reasons. This desire for local inquiries he could assure their Lordships, was one which was very generally felt in Scotland; the demand by public authorities in Scotland to have the applications for Parliamentary powers in regard to local interests made the subject of local inquiry had recently acquired a very considerable addition of strength. There had been petitions from a great number of municipalities and County Councils in Scotland; and resolutions urging upon the Government the desirability of a change had also been passed by political associations, chambers of commerce, and many other bodies. The reasons advanced were the great expense attendant upon the present system, which was a bar to many small schemes on account of the great initial cost, and the unfairness which the great cost of Parliamentary inquiry entailed upon the opponents to large schemes who might not have the pecuniary means to present their objections which might be real and serious. He thought there was also a strong objection from a Scottish point of view to the entire centralisation in London of inquiries for purely local objects. Many such matters as extensions of municipal boundaries, proposals for fresh supplies of water, for tramway enterprise, and other matters ought, in the opinion of those interested, to be inquired into nearer the locality than was the case at present. He did not forget that, although separate Private Bills might affect only individual interests, yet the sum of all the interests that were involved in all the private Bills which came before Parliament was of very large importance. He certainly would not say anything which could be interpreted into hostility to the present form of tribunal. He dared say that mistakes were sometimes made, but upon the whole he believed the decisions of the Private Bills Committees, both of that House and of the other, were generally accepted as wise and fair. He believed that, so far as the individual tribunal was concerned, there was almost complete confidence in the system; the desirability of a change was based on other grounds. Certainly not the least valuable part of the present system was the general supervision over private Bill legislation which was exercised by the Chairman of Committees of that House, and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the other. As the result of many years' experience in the examination and amendment of Private Bills, the authorities of both Houses had settled the contents and phraseology of what were termed model Bills, which, with the necessary modifications, must be applied to all private Bills to which they referred. It was quite clear that Parliament could not part with authority over such matters as those, and he thought he should carry the House with him when he said that in such matters the proper amount of uniformity could only be maintained by keeping the ultimate control in the hands of both Houses through their Chairmen of Committees. So far as he was personally concerned he was not in favour of the appointment of one permanent tribunal to do the work of examining private Bills. Such a tribunal, however able, would get into fixed habits and form fixed prejudices out of which it would be difficult for them to raise themselves, and he was pretty certain that if such a tribunal had obtained in the past it would not so readily have adapted itself to the changed circumstances and demands of public opinion as had been the case with Private Bills Committees conducted and controlled by decisions of both Houses. In the consideration of possible reforms they were face to face with the fact that no scheme which had ever been mooted had attempted to do away with the ultimate control of Parliament. But the problem which had been fatal to many of these schemes had been this—how to make the control of Parliament real and effective, and yet get rid from Parliament of the labour of the Committee stage. As he had said, all the proposals that had been made had been on one of two main lines—one, that Bills originated in Parliament should be referred to the tribunal for the Committee stage, and come back again after consideration; another, that Bills should originate before a permanent Commission, and only come to Parliament in the form of completed schemes. It seemed to him that there were two objections which would always prove fatal to such proposals. Was the tribunal in either case to give reasons for its decision? If it did not, Parliament would have no material on which to form a judgment on appeal. If it did give reasons he was nearly certain it would become hidebound by precedents of its own creation, and it would be unfair to promoters. Either of these proposals would lead to more of the time—certainly of the House of Commons—being occupied in discussing private Bills on their merits, and whether they should be referred back to the tribunal or rejected. From the present demands on the time of the other House he felt that any system which led to an extension of the practice of private Bills in the whole House would not meet with general acceptance. The main objection to the present system was the demand it made on the time of Members, and the expense to which it put those concerned. The main object to be aimed at in any reform was to do away with these two objections, or to obviate them as far as possible. Now, there was a well-tried system in existence which exactly met the conditions he had laid down. He referred to the system under which Provisional Orders were granted, and the main proposal of the Bill was to assimilate Scottish Private Bill procedure to that which was now pursued in the case of Provisional Orders. As he had said there might be some schemes of such magnitude or nature as were not fitted for this procedure. He did not attempt to define them in the Bill. But it was proposed that if anyone interested in a Provisional Order, whether petitioner or opponent, thought the subject-matter of the Order was of sufficient magnitude and importance to be dealt with in the form of a Private Bill, he could petition the Secretary for Scotland to that effect. The Secretary for Scotland would lay the petition before the Chairman of Committees in each House, and these three—the Secretary for Scotland and the Chairman of Committees of each House—would be the tribunal to decide whether the subject-matter of the Order should be dealt with by Provisional Order, or was one that might be more properly dealt with by a Private Bill. The Private Bill system was at the present time worked by no less than 14 Government Departments, which worked under about 30 different Acts of Parliament. The procedure was well known, and he would not describe it in detail. A petition was presented by the corporation or individuals who desired Parliamentary powers, to the Department to promulgate a draft Order. The petition and draft order were referred to a tribunal selected by the Department, and on the report of that tribunal the Department decided whether it would grant the order and lay it before Parliament, or whether it would refuse the petition. The Provisional Order system had been successful in the past. Certainly it was cheaper than the present system of private Bill legislation, and it afforded facilities for local inquiries which might be in any part of the Kingdom affected. During the last 10 years the Board of Trade had made 624 Provisional Orders. Of these, only 62 were petitioned against, and only 19 of the 62 were rejected or amended. So he might claim that the system of Provisional Orders had been successful in the past, and there was no reason why, under the safeguards of the Bill it should not be applied to matters of greater importance and larger magnitude than had been the case hitherto. During the last 10 years the Scotch Office had put 28 Provisional Orders before Parliament, of which only three had been opposed, and two rejected. The system proposed under the Bill was that the promoters of a scheme should lodge a draft Provisional Order with the Secretary for Scotland, and copies with all the Departments concerned, and the Private Bill Office of both Houses. The object of this was to preserve general control over the model clauses, and the Chairman of Committees of both Houses, or anyone interested, might petition in the manner described to have the matter dealt with by Private Bill rather than by Provisional Order. Assuming that such a petition were not presented, or the Secretary for Scotland and the Chairmen of Committees decided that the proposal was a proper one for procedure by Provisional Order, the special procedure would be this: the Secretary for Scotland, acting with the Chairmen of Committees, would settle the tribunal which was to hear the opposition, if any, to the Order. This tribunal would be selected in the following way. It would consist either of a Judge of the Court of Session, or the Sheriff of one of the counties, either of whom would be selected by the President of the Court of Session. Along with this judicial person would be two lay Commissioners, who would be selected from a panel of twelve, and would remain in force for five years. The panel of twelve would be convened in this way. The Conveners of the County Councils of Scotland and some representatives of the boroughs would meet under the Chairmanship of the Secretary for Scotland, and would select twelve persons in whom they had confidence to form the panel from which the individual two would be selected by the Secretary for Scotland and the Chairmen of Committees to try each case that might be brought before them. If that tribunal made any alteration in the draft Order it would be the duty of the Secretary for Scotland to submit to the Chairmen of Committees of both Houses the Order in its new form, and if there were anything in their opinion contrary to the general legislation sanctioned by Parliament, it would be their business to communicate them to him. If against the Order so adjusted no memorial were presented, it would become final. But if anyone felt himself aggrieved and desired to take the opinion of a Parliamentary Committee it would be possible for him to present a petition to the Secretary for Scotland, upon which the Secretary for Scotland would be bound to lay the Order before Parliament in the form of a confirming Bill. When it got to Parliament a Joint Committee of both Houses would be formed to consider it, before whom, subject to liability for costs, any opponent might be heard. The proposal for a Joint Committee might not meet with universal acceptance. But he contended that it was a rational proposal, would economise a great deal of time, and it was the only method he could think of —if there were other methods he should be glad to hear of them—by which the control of Parliament could be effectively preserved without taking an undue amount of the time of Members or putting to undue expense those who had to appear before the tribunal. If, in addition to a local inquiry, they had first a Committee of one House, and possibly a Committee of another, they would not do anything to cheapen the cost of Private Bill procedure. But he believed there would not be many cases in which after a local inquiry an appeal would be made to Parliament. The experience of Provisional Order procedure strengthened that belief. No doubt the scheme he had endeavoured to outline was in some points open to criticism. The difficulty of the whole subject was great, as had been proved by its past history. He had done his best to make this a practical scheme. If it preserved the control of Parliament it would be found to have many advantages. It provided for a local inquiry before a competent yet not permanent tribunal. It enabled Parliamentary powers to be obtained without coming to Westminster, if opponents and promoters were satisfied. The Parliamentary inquiry, if demanded, would be a single one by a Joint Committee and not a double one by a Select Committee of each House, and certainly the supremacy of Parliament would be preserved in every case in which anyone who was interested desired to appeal to it. At the same time adequate safeguards were provided against any Parliamentary powers being granted which would be inconsistent with the general practice of Parliament or the due protection of the public interest. He was sure the House greatly regretted the absence from its precincts of Sir Joseph Warner, who was a long and well-tried servant of successive Chairmen of Committees. He thought it right to consult Sir Joseph as to these proposals, and he had had a letter from him in which, while making some criticisms—to some of which he had endeavoured to give effect—he said that he considered this—

> "the best practical scheme for localising Private Bill legislation that he had yet seen suggested by a competent authority."

The scheme was put forward with a full consciousness of the many difficulties of the question. He hoped he had been able to give an intelligible account of the Government's proposals, and he had thought it right in a matter of this magnitude to explain the scheme before the Bill was read a First time. ["Hear, hear!"] After this explanation he begged to move that the Bill be read a First time. ["Hear, hear!"]

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH thought that men of all parties in Scotland were agreed that a change in Private Bill procedure in regard to that country was desirable, therefore he was able heartily to congratulate his noble Friend in having seized that opinion, and having endeavoured to some extent to meet it It seemed to him, however, that the best ground, both for attack and defence of the Bill, would be found in the sentence: "It is such a little one." Without entering into any criticism of the Bill, he would point out that practically it would only deal with one very small section of private business—namely, that which was likely to be unopposed. If a Bill were likely to be seriously opposed it would, under the scheme, naturally come before Parliament in very much the same fashion as now. He quite admitted that, with regard to matters which were sometimes now dealt with by Provisional Orders, and sometimes by unopposed Private Bills, it would give new facilities and prove less expensive than the present system. But the necessity of this change had always been urged on the ground of the desirability of devolving from Parliament a great deal of its business down to the country, not merely unopposed, but also opposed, private business, and so giving larger scope to the expression of local opinion. It seemed to him that the Bill would not carry out this idea, except in the case of those Bills which were not likely to be opposed; and in the case of all great Bills it would still be necessary to come to Parliament. He did not think that Scotch opinion would be satisfied with merely having facilities given for the easier passage of unopposed private business, but would demand that private business as a whole should be dealt with by Scotsmen in Scotland. ["Hear, hear!"]

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN desired to ask two questions. The noble Lord had said that any person wishing to proceed by Provisional Order would petition. In that case who would draw up and start the Provisional Order? In regard to the panel of 12 men from whom the tribunal of two was to be selected, was it proposed to pay the members of that panel?

*Lord BALFOUR replied that the promoters would lodge the draft Order which they desired should be made. With regard to the second question, it was proposed that the two lay commissioners should be paid for the time they sat on the tribunal. It was not proposed that they should be salaried officials, or that any vested interest should be created. They would be eligible to serve for a period of five years, and might be reappointed to that office or might not. It would rest with the Secretary for Scotland and Chairmen of Committees to select those who were to sit with the Judge or Sheriff on each case, and for the time that they sat such remuneration would be paid them as might be fixed by the Treasury.

Lord MORRIS regarded the Bill as one which made a step in the right direction, but desired to know why a Measure of this kind was made applicable to Scotland and not to Ireland. There had been much agitation on the part of the Chambers of Commerce, leading merchants, and others interested in Ireland on this question, complaints being made of the enormous expense to which the country was put in Private Bill legislation. Every reason his noble Friend had given applied *a fortiori* to Ireland. It was a poorer country, more distant, and it was more oppressive and expensive for her people to come over her to pass unopposed Bills, or Bills to which there might be some opposition. He should be glad to know why this Bill had not been made applicable to Ireland, as it could have been by very slight alteration.

Bill to provide for improving and extending the procedure for obtaining Parliamentary powers by way of Provisional Orders in matters relating to Scotland; presented by Lord Balfour; and Read 1^a; to be printed; and to be Read 2^a on Thursday next.—[No. 81.]

LAND VALUATION (IRELAND).

*Viscount CLIFDEN rose to ask the Prime Minister if he would have printed and laid on the Table the

> "instructions to the valuators and surveyors appointed under the 15th and 16th Vict. cap. 3, for the uniform valuation of lands and tenements in Ireland,"

by Colonel Griffith in the year 1853. He thought it was a very good time for these instructions made some 45 years ago, to be brought to light again. He was sorry to say that by the action of Parliament any valuation of that sort had become obsolete. Comparisons, if fairly conducted, might lead them to some tangible and reasonable result, and if noble Lords would look through these rules they would find that they were a marvel of honesty, industry, and intelligence. For instance, there were 64 instructions in connection with the valuation of tenements. How many of these instructions would the Land Commissioners who were now valuing Ireland look into? These men were reducing the landlords to abject poverty, and were taking the land out of the hands of one set of people to give it to another. They had had the official announcement from a noble Earl—who, he was sorry to say, was leaving them for the Antipodes—that there was no test or examination whatever for the new Sub-Commissioners when they were appointed, but that all of them had been seen by that eminent agriculturist, the Chief Secretary for Ireland. [*Laughter.*] Whether that was or was not sufficient for the English people he did not know, but it was not sufficient for him and those who thought with him, and he wanted English peers to understand what was well done some 45 years ago under instructions which were now thrown into the waste-paper basket.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH observed that, at the request of the Prime Minister, he would reply to the Question of the noble Lord. He was afraid the Government considered that, as it was some 44 years since the instructions referred to were issued, it was not advisable to have them reprinted and laid on the Table as suggested. When the Question was put down, it was not known whether the noble Lord was asking for information, or whether, as it now appeared, he was asking that the rules should be printed for the information of their Lordships; and he had brought down with him a copy of the instructions for the benefit of the noble Lord, who he now found did not require it. He was sorry the noble Lord had fault to find with the valuations as now carried on, but the House would hardly expect him to embark at this time upon such a thorny subject as the treatment of the land question in Ireland.

*VISCOUNT CLIFDEN thought he had gathered the noble Lord's determination, but he had not absolutely said he would not have the instructions printed. Again, the noble Lord had only very incorrectly noticed what had been put down in the Question on the Paper. He wanted to have the instructions which the noble Lord held in his hand, printed and laid on the Table of the House. Why should they not be put into the form of a Parliamentary Paper, and laid on the Table? ["Hear, hear!"]

THE EARL OF DENBIGH believed that the instructions were obtainable by any noble Lord who wished to see them. His instructions from the Irish Office were that the Government considered it to be inadvisable to print them, inasmuch as they were printed so long ago.

*VISCOUNT CLIFDEN said that this might be a good reason against reading the Bible, though he did not agree with it. [*Laughter.*] The statement containing the rules would be just as good now as it was when printed. It was very difficult to get the book. He had a copy of the volume, though it was not his own; but the book was a very different thing from having the instructions laid on the Table of the House as a Parliamentary Paper with the *imprimatur* of the Government. ["Hear, hear!"] He gathered, however, that the Government did not wish English peers to know how land should be valued in Ireland.

EARL SPENCER supported the appeal of the noble Viscount. He failed to see the force of the argument of the noble Earl against granting this Return. There could be no doubt that this was a matter of deep interest to all who were connected with Irish land. Griffith's valuation had always been looked upon as a valuable and excellent document. He was not sure whether these regulations were confidential; but, if they were not, he thought that the argument which the noble Earl had used as to their being printed so long ago ought not to prevail. ["Hear, hear!"]

House adjourned at Five minutes past Six o'Clock, till To-morrow, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LOCHEARNHEAD, ST. FILLANS, AND COMRIE RAILWAY BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended, Read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into consideration."

MR. JAMES BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) moved to leave out the words "now taken into consideration," in order to add instead thereof the words "re-committed to a Select Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection." The right hon. Gentleman said that he thought that there were special grounds for his asking the House to take this somewhat exceptional course in this case. The proposed railway, if constructed, would run through the valley of the Earn, which was one of the most beautiful glens in Scotland, would destroy one of the most exquisite drives in that part of the country, and he did not hesitate to say that it would utterly ruin the peculiar charm of the locality. ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill was opposed by a large majority of the local residents on various grounds, such as that the railway would destroy the beauty of the scenery, that it would reduce the value of their property for letting purposes, and that it would interfere with the numerous crofts in the valley. It was most unfortunate that the great majority of those who were opposed to the construction of the railway had no *locus standi* before the Committee, owing to the fact that it was not proposed to take their land, although undoubtedly the construction of the line would depreciate the letting value of their houses. But, in addition to the local residents, a large number of persons all over Scotland were opposed to the construction of the railway on the ground that it would completely destroy one of the most beautiful valleys in the country. It was most unfortunate that those who had a *locus standi* before the Committee had been induced to withdraw their opposition to the Bill, and that thus the Measure had been allowed to pass through the Committee stage as unopposed. A petition against the Bill had been signed by the most influential and representative men in Scotland, who, having no *locus standi*, had had no opportunity of laying their views before the Committee. It was on this ground that he had taken the somewhat unusual step of opposing the Bill at this late stage. The object of his Instruction was to empower the Committee to inquire whether the construction of the railway would affect materially the beauty of the scenery. It really embodied the ground of his opposition to the Bill. The House last year had instructed the Committee on the Light Railways Bill to make inquiries as to whether the construction of such railways would seriously detract from the natural beauty of the scenery of the district through which it was proposed they should run, and he now asked the House to take a similar course on the present occasion. He trusted that the House would take into consideration the strong local feeling that prevailed in reference to this matter, especially as there was another route along which the line might be made, which would not injure the scenery of the valley in any way. He trusted that the House would accept his Motion to recommit the Bill in order that the merits of the cases on both sides might be thoroughly inquired into. He begged to move the Motion of which he had given notice. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR DONALD CURRIE (Perthshire, W.) seconded the Amendment. He said that when the Bill was first suggested he was invited to promise to put his name on the back of it, and he agreed; but subsequently he felt it his duty to withdraw this promise, when he was told the details, on the ground that his constituents in the district, by a great majority, were unwilling that the Bill should be approved by the House. He had no reason to believe that they had changed their opinion. He was not going to discuss the question of the route, but he objected, in the interests of his constituents and of people in the neighbourhood whose property would be injured, as well as on the general grounds stated by the right hon. Gentleman, to the Bill in its present form.

*SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) said that, like the hon. Member for West Perthshire, he had put his name on the back of the Bill. The hon. Member had withdrawn his name because of the conflict of opinion in his constituency. That consideration did not affect him. He was induced to back this Bill because, like a number of his constituents, he was in favour of multiplying, as far as possible, the outlets for their crowded population, both for summer residences and for daily excursions. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bryce) had said that the great preponderance of local feeling was against the Bill. That was one of the several points which the promoters strongly contested. Five petitions were lodged against the Bill, praying to be heard by counsel and witnesses, and these petitions were successively withdrawn, arrangements being come to with the petitioners; but the promoters were ready to go into the Committee, and had their witnesses ready to support every one of the statements they had made in favour of the Bill. With regard to the local feeling, it was as well that the House should know who were the actual promoters of the Bill. The Chairman was Colonel Hay Drummond, the Convener of the county of Perth, who would not from his position lend himself to anything that he believed to be either destructive to scenery or injurious to the interests of the county. The second promoter was the Lord Provost of Perth, a gentleman highly respected by all who knew him, and one who took a most active interest in the affairs both of the city and the county. An important business promoter was Mr. Fraser, of the firm of Macdonald, Fraser, and Co., auctioneers, Perth, who supported the line in the interests of the farmers because of the facilities it would afford for bringing their sheep and cattle into the market. The remaining promoter to whom he would refer was the Lord Provost of the city of Dundee, whose sole interest in the Bill was a public interest. Gentlemen who were familiar with the railway arrangements of the district knew that if they wished to go from the west of Scotland to the east through the city of Perth they must make a long détour to the south via Dunblane and Callander. The trains were very awkward, and loss of time was entailed in making that journey. By the construction of this short length of railway the distance would be considerably shortened. and they would be able to step into a train in Dundee and go over to Oban in about four hours. The opponents of the Bill had not availed themselves of the legitimate opportunity of opposition before the Committee. The Bill, having been initiated in the House of Commons, there was still the ordinary course left of opposing it in the House of Lords. The Committee of the other House would, no doubt, give fair and reasonable consideration to any and every representation that might be made to it. He was, as much as any man in the House, in favour of respecting the beauty of our scenery, but there was this difference between him and some other hon. Gentlemen, that while they desired to preserve the enjoyment of that scenery for the wealthier classes, he was in favour of extending to the masses of the people in our great towns and cities the privilege of also enjoying the grandeur and the beauties of nature. Concluding, he said he regretted that there had on this occasion been a departure from the ordinary course, and that the time of the House should be taken up with a discussion which in all fairness and propriety, ought to have taken place in the Committee.

Mr. C. B. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) said that those who supported the Motion for the recommittal of the Bill suggested practically that after a Measure had gone through all the stages prescribed by the Standing Orders, and its promoters had fulfilled all the conditions laid down, a new duty should be imposed upon them. According to the right hon. Member opposite, himself, there was only one precedent for the course which was proposed, and he (Mr. Renshaw) did not think that it ought to be followed in this case, there being no formal objection by the inhabitants of the locality concerned to the provisions of the Bill under consideration. He should certainly vote against the Instruction.

Sir CHARLES DALRYMPLE (Ipswich) associated himself with the right hon. Member opposite, and hoped that they would not be precluded from taking the course which he suggested merely because it was unusual. There was no doubt that facts which ought to have been considered had not been placed before the Committee to whom the Bill had gone. As a rule no doubt that House paid the greatest respect to the decisions of Committees, but this was an exceptional case. Considerations of convenience urged on behalf of the populations of large towns situated at a great distance from a district that would be affected by the construction of a railway ought not to prevail beyond a certain point, and he did not think that in this case such considerations ought to overrule the views of the inhabitants of Perthshire.

***Mr. MELLOR** (York, W.R., Sowerby) reminded the House that this was not an attempt to defeat the Bill, and said that he intended to vote for its recommittal. The point involved was a very important one. The question was what the House ought to do when a private Bill was introduced, and the petitioners against it disappeared. It was well known that there were people who wished to oppose Bills but could not afford to do so. These people ought to be considered, and the general public also. This Bill had been Read a Second time without opposition, because people who had not petitioned, but who desired to oppose it, believed that it would go to an ordinary Select Committee. The petitions against it were, however, withdrawn, and the Bill went in the ordinary course in such cases to the Unopposed Bill Committee, before whom no one could appear to give reasons against the preamble. There was no public officer whose duty it was to attend the Unopposed Bill Committee, or, indeed, any Committee to give information and protect the rights of the public. Who are the proper guardians of these rights if this House be not? It is plain that circumstances may arise in which it becomes the duty of this House to interfere and instruct the Committee as my right hon. Friend now proposes to do, and as was done in the Ennerdale case. The Members of the Unopposed Bill Committee were ignorant of the facts put before the House that day by his right hon. Friend, and the Bill passed through the Committee as a matter of course. Under the circumstances it would be simple justice to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, before whom opponents could appear and state their case. Railway promoters as a rule had hard hearts, and cared little for beautiful scenery or ancient buildings. Some years ago a railway promoter informed him that he had gone with a party to Kenilworth Castle to ascertain whether it could be converted into a railway station. [*Laughter.*] It was urged that the scheme which this Bill would sanction would seriously interfere with some very beautiful scenery. He took the view that they ought to do what they could to protect such scenery against disfigurement. The Bill should be sent to a Select Committee, before whom his right hon. Friend could appear and state all that he knew about this matter. Hon. Members would see from the statements that had been circulated that the allegations on either side were such that it was quite impossible for the House to decide this question itself. Whether the promoters of the Bill were right, or whether its opponents were right, the interests of the public ought to be protected by the investigations of a Select Committee. That would be the most simple and direct mode of inquiry, and it would result in justice being done.

Sir J. KINLOCH (Perthshire, E.) supported the Motion of the right hon. Member for Aberdeen. The railway could be constructed on the south side of the loch just as well as on the north, and if that course were followed the scenery would not be spoilt.

*Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Chairman of Ways and Means, Cumberland, Penrith) said that while he agreed with most of the statements of the right hon. Member for the Sowerby Division, he differed from him on one point. The right hon. Member said that this Bill ought to be sent to a Select Committee in the ordinary way. But that was just what had been done already. If the House agreed to the Motion of the right hon. Member for Aberdeen the promoters of the Bill would have just ground of complaint. They had done nothing wrong, but had complied in every respect with the Parliamentary conditions imposed on the promoters of railway Bills. The Bill was introduced in the ordinary way in January, and was Read a Second time on February 12, and not a word was said against it. The hon. Member for West Perthshire, who represented the locality through which this railway would pass, had told them that he was prepared at one time to put his name on the back of the Bill, but that he subsequently withdrew his approval of the Measure because there was so much opposition against it.

*Sir DONALD CURRIE said that when he was asked to promise his name on the back of the Bill he did not know what the route of the railway was. When he found out, before it was printed, what the route was to be, he intimated to the promoters that he should not give the support of his name to the Bill.

*Mr. J. W. LOWTHER thought that the course taken by the hon. Member was very natural. The hon. Member very reasonably did not wish to make himself unpopular with his constituents. But it was, in the circumstances, a singular thing that not a single word should have been heard against the Bill until that day. The Bill had gone in the ordinary course as an opposed Bill to a Committee. There were five petitions against that Bill, and the petitioners claimed to be heard. What happened? The promoters of the Bill came to terms with their enemies, and they agreed to certain conditions; and amongst others was one that they should pay the cost of the petitions. After a time they withdrew the petitions, and now hon. Gentlemen opposite asked them to take what he considered a very unusual course upon the Third Reading, asking that the Bill should be recommitted. He had no interest in the Bill one way or the other. He was only concerned to see that the private Bill procedure followed its usual course, and that justice was done to the parties. He thought injustice would be done to the promoters if the course suggested were followed. He concluded by saying that he asked the House to reject the Motion on this ground, that injustice would be done to the promoters of the Bill. It was his duty to vote against the Motion.

MR. BRYCE desired to make an explanation. He had never heard of the Bill until it had passed its Second Reading. Of course he would have raised the question then. He had made arrangements to move the Instruction while the Bill was before the opposed Committee, when suddenly the Opposition was "squared," and his opportunity was gone.

MR. R. B. HALDANE (Haddington), said he lived in the neighbourhood of this railway and knew something of the locality. Reference had been made to the position in which the House found itself through the petitions against the Bill having been withdrawn, and this Debate and the situation in which they were showed more than anything the necessity—for the measure to which the Government had given its sanction—for having some at least of these private Bill inquiries in the locality where the matter could be gone into. [*Cheers.*] The people who came before the House to give information in a matter of this kind were necessarily wealthy people. The public generally could not petition. In this case, one of the petitioners—Lady Helen Macgregor, whose property was affected—had withdrawn, because the expense of appearing with witness and counsel to oppose the Bill was greater than she felt she was justified in undertaking. The promoters had taken the position which a well-to-do corporation could always take, and had bought Lady Macgregor's opposition off. Allusion had been made to the costs which the promoters had paid, but they had not paid any of the costs of opposition before a Select Committee, or of bringing witnesses up, or, in fact, any of the heavy substantial costs of private Bill legislation. They had only paid those preliminary expenses which in their nature were not heavy. Those who represented the public in this matter had some right to complain. They were entitled to rely when these petitions were presented, and when they knew that there was some opposition to the Bill, that in the ordinary course the Bill would go before a Committee, where its merits would be investigated, and where the House would have some opportunity of satisfying themselves that the matter had been looked into. He agreed that the railway would confer great advantage, and he hoped to see it made, but that was not the question before the House. The question was whether it should be taken by a route where it would do inexpressible damage to scenery which was almost unique, or whether it should be taken by another route where it would do much less damage. The hon. Member for Dundee spoke of finding an outlet for the population of Dundee, on whose behalf he addressed the House. He agreed that there ought to be an outlet for the population of Dundee. But his hon. Friend spoke as if Dundee were somewhere near this scenery. Dundee was a good 50 miles away, and Perth at least 25 miles. The question was as to the route the railway was to take. Everybody directly connected with the locality had spoken strongly against the proposed route. Both the Members for the county were against it, and all the information that had reached him from people living in the locality was to the effect that they would regard the proposed route as injurious to their interests and unnecessary. The present request was a modest one. It was that the House should not sanction this proceeding without some investigation. If there were an investigation before a Select Committee they would then have a guarantee that the merits of the matter would be gone into. No substantial expense had yet been incurred, and the promoters would merely find themselves in the position in which they ought to have been if the matter had been properly dealt with in the first instance.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said the Bill had not been considered in the interests of the public. The hon. Member for Dund had given the names of those who now promoted the Bill, but he would call attention to the name of gentlemen who had ceased to be promoters. The hon. Member for the Western Division of the county had withdrawn his name. The Provost of Broughty Ferry and, he believed, the Lord Provost of Dundee, had also withdrawn their names as promoters. Why had they done so? They were reported in the public press to have said that they had been told that the inhabitants of Comrie were in hearty sympathy with the scheme; but when they went to Comrie and discovered the strong sentiment against the railway they withdrew their names. Five petitions were presented against the Bill, two of which were by railway companies and one by crofters, whose interests were injuriously affected. At the last moment, before the time expired for these petitions being lodged, one of them was withdrawn, and it was stated that certain persons whose property was to be dealt with had been very generously treated. Notwithstanding that, many people in small houses in the villages had been ruined, and had not had a penny given to them. He supported the Amendment on the general ground that, as a member of the public, he was entitled to oppose a Bill which was likely to do a great deal of harm in the neighbourhood through which the railway was to pass, and also on the ground that the majority of people whose interests were injuriously affected could not afford to employ counsel to represent them before the Committee. Dealing with the details of the Bill, the hon. Member was understood to object strongly to the fact that the proposed railway would repeatedly cross the high road and would therefore be a source of public danger. In the statement made by the promoters of the Bill it was said that the road was crossed only once. That was an altogether misleading statement, the meaning of which was that the road was only once crossed after leaving a particular village until Lochearnhead was reached. He submitted that the Bill ought to be recommitted, in order that the merits of the Bill might be gone into.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said he might claim to speak as an inhabitant of Perthshire, and he hoped he was not less careful of the preservation of beautiful scenery than hon. Gentlemen who opposed the Bill. The same idea of spoiling the scenery was advanced both in the case of the railway through the pass of Killiecrankie and Glenfarg, but those localities were still largely resorted to by tourists. If he gave his view as an expert in scenery, he would have preferred to see the railway taken on the other side of the loch; but he supported the Bill on much broader grounds. An hon. Member opposite spoke as if the Unopposed Bill Committee were utterly uninformed as to the merits of the Bill. So far as anything asked for by the promoters infringing on the general law, all these private Bills were very carefully scrutinised in the various offices, and if there were anything objectionable in them on that ground notice would be taken of it. The question of which side of the loch the railway should go was not a public question. The question now raised might have been raised before the Committee, and even now those who objected to the Bill could still do everything they wanted to before the Lords.

MR. BRYCE said he was obliged to make the motion in the House of Commons, because the question could not be raised without an instruction, and he had not heard of any instruction in the Lords.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE did not pretend to be familiar with the procedure of the House of Lords, but he thought that there would be ample opportunity found there to do what was desired. He should oppose the Amendment because he thought it would open the door to great inconvenience. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) contended that there was no reason why the railway should not go on the south side of the Loch instead of on the north side. On the day before the Bill was put down on the Paper he saw the Parliamentary agent for the promoters, who agreed that the Bill should not be proceeded with for several days, yet on the following day it appeared on the Paper. He thought that was a very unreasonable course of proceeding after a distinct arrangement had been made. It would make him fight shy of making arrangements in the future, and never again would he take the word of that Parliamentary agent. [*Cheers and laughter*]. The House had heard a great deal about beautiful scenery. He admired scenery as much as any man in the House, but fine scenery would not fill empty stomachs. [*Laughter*]. He pointed out that in many cases crofts would be cut in two by this railway, without any provision being made for compensating the holders.

*MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) said the Chairman of Committees seemed to be under the impression that the oppositon at this stage was due to the action of one of the persons concerned, who had petitioned against the Bill and then withdrawn the petition. He thought it was only right that the House should know that Lady Helen Macgregor did not do anything which led to the action of his right hon. Friend, or of others who were opposing the Bill. Any letters from her which had appeared were due to those who had written to her to obtain her opinion. The opposition originated with the inhabitants of St. Fillans, with whom he had had personal friendship for many years, and who had no *locus standi.* From his knowledge of the district and of their wishes he was convinced that his right hon. Friend was thoroughly justified in his Motion.

*MR. J. W. LOWTHER said the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty implied there had been some breach of faith on the part of the promoters. On referring to the Votes he found that the Bill was down for Second Reading on the 8th of February. Objection was raised to its being taken then, and it was not taken until the 12th of February. Four days therefore, were allowed.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) protested against the line taken by the Lord Advocate and the Chairman of Committees. Both those Gentlemen had put the merits of the Bill on one side and addressed themselves to the question of procedure. Everyone admitted that a railway between the two points specified might be made with advantage, and yet everyone who knew the locality felt that the line proposed would interfere very seriously with the interests of persons who had not been sufficiently rich to oppose the Bill. Opposition was very expensive; and, if the House were going to allow every Bill to which opposition did not come up

in Committee, it was quite clear that injustice would often result. He hoped the House would send the Bill to another Committee.

Question put, "That the words 'now taken into consideration' stand part of the Question:"—The House divided:—Ayes, 159; Noes, 175—(Division List, No. 207.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—

*MR. J. W. LOWTHER said he was sure that as it had now been decided to send this matter back to the Committee, the House would not desire to deprive the promoters from stating their case before the Committee. He therefore begged to move the addition of the words, "And that the promoters have leave to appear by themselves, their counsel, or agents."

Words amended, by adding, at the end thereof, the words "and that the Promoters of the Bill have leave to appear by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents."—(*Mr. J. W. Lowther.*)

Words added.

MR. BRYCE moved:—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to inquire and report whether the railway proposed to be authorised by the Bill, will, if constructed along the line mentioned in the Bill, so seriously injure the scenery of the valley and lake along which it is to pass as to make it inexpedient to pass the Bill, and that the Committee have power to call witnesses and receive evidence on the subject."

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be re-committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection, and that the Promoters of the Bill have leave to appear by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to inquire and report whether the railway proposed to be authorised by the Bill will, if constructed along the line mentioned in the Bill, so seriously injure the scenery of the valley and lake along which it is to pass as to make it inexpedient to pass the Bill, and that the Committee have power to call witnesses and receive evidence on the subject.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham) rose to move :—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the East London Water Bill that they have power to insert a clause providing that the term 'the annual rateable value of the tenement supplied with water' shall have the same meaning in the districts outside the metropolis supplied by the company as the term now has within the metropolitan area."

He said he was asking permission to place before the Committee now sitting a question that concerned a large number of persons resident beyond the boundaries of the metropolis. The charges for the supply of water were levied on the annual value of the tenement supplied with water, and those words formed the basis of all water charges levied within the metropolitan area and in the large area outside the metropolis supplied by the companies which also supplied the central area. The words were found in the Act of 1847, and for 41 years they were acted upon by the various companies, including the East London Companies, with more or less friction between the companies and the consumers. The frictions grew so great that in 1885 an Act was passed defining these words in the sense of the value set upon the tenement by the local assessing authority, but the Act applied only to the metropolis. Under that Act, the East London Company, in common with the other water companies, levied their charges on the annual value as defined by the Local Authority, but, as the Act was strictly limited to the metropolitan area, one set of charges for the supply of water by the East London Water Company obtained within the metropolitan area, and a totally different set of charges was made on the consumers supplied by the same company in the extra-metropolitan area. They had two tenements in the same street rated at exactly the same amount, but persons living on one side of the street, outside the metropolitan area, paid more for the supply of water than those living on the other side of the street, which was within the metropolitan area. He could not conceive any justification for the continuance of such an anomaly which was, in his opinion, a great injustice on the people residing in the populous extra-metropolitan areas. He asked, by his Instruction, that the Committee now sitting should have power to inquire into the circumstances, to hear evidence, and to decide whether or not this grievance should continue or whether it should be remedied by the incorporation of a clause in the Bill now under their consideration. The question was not now brought forward for the first time. In 1886, a Committee was sitting on the East London Bills and the then Chairman of the Committee, Lord Claud Hamilton, pointed out, on the 13th April, that—

> "The Committee are of opinion that a new clause will be wanted. In the opinion of the Committee it is very desirable that West Ham should be included for water purposes within the metropolitan area and should be subject to the same advantages both as regards continuous supply and the mode of rating as applies to the rest of the East London Company's District subject to the provisions of the Metropolitan Water Act 1871. No doubt the representative of West Ham will frame a clause carrying out the views of the Committee."

Some technical difficulties arose. It was pleaded on behalf of the companies, that the petitioners had not included this point in their petition, and on that point, and the further contention that there was not at that time a similar method of assessment adopted in the extra-metropolitan area as prevailed in the metropolitan district, the Committee finally decided against the extra-metropolitan areas. He was informed by those who ought to know that the second objection no longer holds good, inasmuch as the system of assessment had been revised in the extra-metropolitan areas and was now practically, on the same footing as the system within the metropolis. If that were the case, one objection had now disappeared, and the second objection, the mere technical objection, could not now be maintained. He did not want the House to constitute itself judge and jury in this technical question. It was a question which necessarily involved the presence of experts who would place before the Committee the evidence both for and against the proposal. He was not asking the House to pronounce an opinion on the question, but simply asking that the Committee should be given power to go into the question and to hear and determine the case on its merits. If the evidence satisfied the Committee that the existing condition of things rendered such a clause undesirable, they would reject it; but it was perfectly possible that the Committee would come to the same conclusion as the Committee over which Lord Claud Hamilton presided. He could not understand why there should be any objection to the proposal, seeing that the Instruction was only permissive. Certain of the extra-metropolitan areas had petitioned to have the clause inserted and they were alive to the possibility of their petition being rejected on the ground that the Committee had no power to deal with the question. He sought to remove that technical objection. He was told that the Bill was simply one asking for more storage, to enable the Company to discharge its statutory obligations to consumers within the area. To a certain extent that was true, but it was not the whole truth. The water company were asking for another half-a-million of money to provide storage, and consumers would reap a certain amount of advantage; but no one would convince him that the directors, in view of their obligations to their shareholders, were going to undertake this enormous work as a pure matter of charity to the consumers. The merest child must know that unless there were some profit to be derived, the company would not be likely to undertake the work. He had no wish to contest that point. All he wanted was that the Company should deal equitably as between ratepayer and ratepayer, no matter where they happened to reside. It was an injustice which ought no longer to continue, that people in London who happened to be separated by a street should be paying higher charges for water on one side of the street than on the other. He might be told that he was supporting a principle of robbery. He had no sympathy with any project that would deprive the water company of what they might legitimately claim; but he saw no injustice in enacting that the rates which prevailed in the metropolitan area should prevail in the other districts. He was told that the thing was an impossibility; that the same system of assessment could not be maintained in the extra-metropolitan area; that there were certain safeguards within the metropolitan area which did not exist without. That, however, was a purely technical point which ought not to be argued in the House, but should be left to the Committee upstairs. He had no interest to serve in the matter excepting that which he conceived to be for the benefit of his constituents. He was speaking for more than a quarter of a million of people who were paying rates to this company, which they considered to be abnormally high. It was not a question to which the stigma of robbery and misappropriation should be applied. His desire was to see common justice done as between the company and their consumers. He might be told that this was piecemeal legislation; that it dealt with one company instead of with the whole area. If he could have the whole of the water companies within his purview at that moment he would endeavour to apply the Instruction to the whole of them. But there was no reason why the consumers within the area of the East London Company should be excluded from the proposed benefit because it was not possible at the same moment to include other areas. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Instruction.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping), said that the hon. Member for West Ham had remarked that the terms misappropriation and robbery would probably be applied to his Instruction. He had several times argued the case of the East London Company, but he had never taken that line, or bandied such terms. The case of the company was that they wanted the increased storage to enable them to avoid the danger of drought. The hon. Member had also suggested that the company were asking for these powers with a view to making profit, that this was their only and their first idea. He said distinctly that profit was not their first idea, their first idea was to prevent their running short of water, and the hon. Member for West Ham had no right to impute to the company motives that were not actuating them. The hon. Member was simply endeavouring to extend Torrens' Act to the extra-metropolitan areas without those very checks that were provided by the House in order to ensure fair treatment for the water company within the area. The overseers of outside localities were interested in keeping down the assessment, because the contribution of the locality was based on its aggregate rateable value. The company would have no objection to the same charge being imposed on the extra-metropolitan districts if there were the same checks as to valuation. But even if the hon. Member's hypothetical street were included, there would still be a street beyond that. There must be a boundary somewhere. The hon. Member had called attention to a decision of a previous Committee which had claimed to be in his favour. But the decision of the Committee on the 13th April 1876, was given before the facts were fully placed before the Committee. When they had heard the evidence, Lord Claud Hamilton's Committee decided in the following terms:—

> "We do not insist on any change in the mode of rating, and only agree to a constant supply being compulsory on there being inserted the same conditions as are attached to other portions of the metropolis."

Another Committee in 1894, when the hon. Member for West Ham brought forward a similar proposal, decided as follows:—

> "The Committee have come to the conclusion not to go any farther with the West Ham Clause."

The same question came before a Committee of the House of Lords, and they decided that it would not be safe to interfere with or alter the law as it stood, and they declined to entertain the proposal. If the House of Commons wished to alter the law it ought not to do so by a roundabout method, but ought to deal with all companies that had extra-metropolitan areas, in the same way and in a public Act. It was unfair, after the company had made every effort to meet the objections of hon. Members opposite, that Instructions like this should be sprung upon them at the last moment.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) thought it curious that on the one hand the Government should think it right to relieve districts like West Ham from rates—and that they did think it right was proved by the introduction of the Poor Board Schools Bill—and that on the other hand they should allow the water companies to impose heavier rates upon those districts because they were just outside the London boundary line. The districts to which he referred were far more thickly populated than some of the districts inside the metropolitan area. That was true of West Ham, Walthamstow, and Leyton. The Essex population was quite willing to agree to any checks which the company now had against the people of London. In fact they wanted to be treated in the same way. The assessment was not kept down a bit more in Essex than in London. The Essex County Council took great care that the assessments should not be kept down, and they had gone up enormously in recent years. It was said that the company would not profit by this Bill. That might be true; but the company did profit from the increased consumption in consequence of the growth of the population in the extra-metropolitan area. That population was now being treated worse than the people of London, to whom the company gave the advantage of a preferential rate. He trusted that the House would pass the Instruction.

MR. F. G. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) pointed out that within the metropolitan area there was an authority which laid down the proper way in which to ascertain rateable value, but that outside the Metropolis there was no such authority. The hon. Member for West Ham said that the rateable value was fixed in his constituency as it was in the metropolitan area. There was, however, nothing to prevent the local authorities of West Ham from making a change at any moment, for the powers of such local authorities were unlimited in regard to rates. Upon a house rated at £50 a year they could raise 1s. in the pound if they wanted £2 10s.; but if the assessable annual value were reduced to £25, they could still raise the same amount by increasing the rate to 2s. The water companies, however, could not do the same thing. When a water company came to the House, as in the present instance, and asked for certain powers in order to enable them to benefit the public, it was, to say the least of it, discouraging that Instructions of this nature should be proposed. On a previous occasion the East London Water Company had applied to that House to sanction the steps that were necessary in order that additional reservoirs might be established. The application was resisted on the ground that if it was assented to the profits of the shareholders of the company would be increased. But what had, in fact, occurred? The dividends had been reduced since then by 1 per cent. He asserted that the company had not brought this Measure forward with the object of increasing the shareholders' profits, but in order to guard the consumers against the risk of future drought.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that he understood that the view of the company was that this was a Bill to supplement one which was introduced and sanctioned last year. That Bill gave greater storage power to the East London Water Company in order to obviate the risk of a recurrence of the water famine. In order to enable the company to carry the Bill of last year into effect this Measure was said to be necessary. An Instruction was now moved which the company alleged might be extremely injurious to them, and his hon. Friend asked that the Committee upstairs should be empowered to consider and discuss the question which was involved in that Instruction. But he apprehended that that was within their powers at the present time. The advocates of the Instruction were, it appeared to him, in this dilemma—if the matter could be discussed by the Committee what was the object of this Instruction? If, on the other hand, it could not be discussed, the supporters of the Instruction were calling upon a Committee to examine into questions which were outside the purview of the Bill. He did not think that adequate reason had been shown for adopting the course proposed. The matter, if dealt with at all, ought to be dealt with in relation to all the water companies, and a public Bill ought to be introduced for the purpose. In the circumstances he did not think that the

House would be well advised in passing the Instruction.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY said that he realised that it would be perfectly futile to press the Motion to a Division in the face of the right hon. Gentleman's statement. He would therefore ask leave to withdraw it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.]

Read the First time; to be read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed—[Bill 248.]

QUESTIONS.

PLYMOUTH HARBOUR WORKS.

MR. F. B. MILDMAY (Devon, Totnes): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty when the steam barge for the Plymouth Harbour Works Department, provided for in last year's Estimates, will be available for use?

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): It is probable that the steam barge will be delivered about the close of the financial year.

ARMY (SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION).

SIR A. F. ACLAND-HOOD (Somerset, Wellington): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the defective ammunition issued to the Guards at Pirbright for musketry practice; whether this is part of the issue which caused dissatisfaction last year; and, whether he will have it withdrawn from use as soon as possible and take steps to insure that it is not re-issued at a future date?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): A report has been received from a battalion of Foot Guards as to defective ammunition, and the supply has been changed. Careful inquiry into all the circumstances is taking place.

VACCINATION (ROYAL COMMISSION).

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board will he explain why a considerable part of the evidence and several of the Special Reports on which the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination is based have not yet been published; and, when this Evidence and these Special Reports will be issued?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I have made inquiry, but have not received any information beyond that I have already communicated to the House.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION (INDIA).

SIR SEYMOUR KING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is yet in a position to announce the decision of the Government of India in regard to the various questions still pending in respect of exchange compensation?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Exchange compensation is authorised for Europeans appointed in England, and for officers appointed as Europeans in India to offices in which European qualifications are held to be indispensable, or to services and departments in which a proportion of Europeans is held by the Government of India to be indispensable. The Government of India are now considering the rules which must be issued in order to carry into effect this decision of the Secretary of State in Council.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Viceroy of India, the Governors and Lieutenant Governors of Presidencies and Provinces and members of the different Councils draw Exchange compensation allowance in addition to their salaries; whether the salaries of some of them are not fixed in rupees by statute; and whether the grant of the allowance taken without statutory amendment is legal; and whether it is a fact that the allowance is granted to such European officers as make no remittances to England; and, if so, on what grounds?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Exchange compensation has hitherto been drawn by all the European officers in India who are entitled to it under the regulations. Among these are about 40 officers whose salaries are fixed in rupees under Statute; and doubts have been raised whether, in their case, the compensation, though obviously equitable, may not be technically illegal. Opinions on that point differ, and the matter is now under my consideration with a view of obtaining further advice. The compensation allowance is intended to protect European officers in India against an excessive depreciation of their emoluments by the fall in exchange, and is confined by the regulations to those classes which as a rule are seriously affected by it; but it is not thought necessary or advisable to make any special inquiry into the private circumstances of individual officers.

BRIGADE OF GUARDS.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, whether all recruits enlisted for general service who are up to the Guards' standard are now taken for the Brigade of Guards at the expense of the rest of the Army; what are the numbers of recruits, exclusive of bandsmen and boys, raised for each regiment of Guards since 1st January 1897, and how many of these are specially enlisted; and what are the present numbers of each regiment of Guards above or below the establishment of 1896?

MR. BRODRICK: No alteration has been made in the recruiting regulations by which it has been laid down for some years past that recruiting for the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and Foot Guards takes precedence of other recruiting. The number of recruits raised for each regiment of Foot Guards since January 1, 1897, was as follows:—Grenadier Guards, 235, of whom 75 were specials; Coldstream Guards, 143, of whom 39 were specials; Scots Guards, 131, of whom 40 were specials. On May 1 the Grenadier Guards were 30 above establishment, the Coldstream Guards 11 above establishment, and the Scots Guards four below establishment. It is necessary to add that, owing to the great activity of trade, and the consequent increase of employment, the recruiting for the Army generally has been unusually slack since January 1, and, while the numbers of Foot Guards have been more than maintained, the rest of the Army is short by nearly 1,600 men.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, arising out of that answer, why, if the strength of the Foot Guards has been more than maintained, it has been thought necessary to reduce the standard to 5ft. 7 in.?

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. and gallant Gentleman is probably aware that there has never been an occasion when an increase in the Army has taken place that the standard has not had to be reduced. In the next place, we have not merely had to maintain the strength of the Foot Guards, but we have to add an extra battalion during the year. That is the reason why the standard has been reduced to that at which it stood for many years.

*SIR C. DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): Has any progress whatever been made towards adding this new battalion to the Guards? Does the battalion yet consist of a single man?

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir, some progress has been made. We were below the establishment for the Foot Guards at the beginning of the year, and now we are above it in the Grenadier and Coldstream Guards. Measures have been taken for the recall of men from the Reserve, which we confidently anticipate will put us in a much better position altogether than before.

LAND SUB-COMMISSIONS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is over 12 months since any court for the disposal of land cases from the union of Bawnboy has sat in county Cavan; and, whether he will inquire into this subject, and direct a Commission to hold a court for the dispatch of the large number of cases pending in this union?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): A Sub-Commission last sat for the disposal of fair rent cases from the Poor Law Union of Bawnboy on the 24th November last. It may be assumed that a sitting will be held there on the earliest possible occasion, having regard to the claims of other districts.

MR. S. YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether a sitting of the Sub-Commission will be held in the present spring for the hearing of numerous cases awaiting trial in the counties of Meath and Cavan in the vicinity of Kingscourt; and whether, as was conceded to Bailieborough, the Commission, for the convenience of the people of that district, will sit in Kingscourt, between which town and Dublin there is easy railway connection, and in which there is an ample Town Hall and superior hotel accommodation.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A Sub-Commission will commence its sittings at Bailieborough on the 18th instant. The Chairman of the Sub-Commission will consider any application that may be made to him for the purpose of holding a special sitting at Kingscourt for the disposal of cases from that district.

LAND COMMISSIONERS.

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland, in view of the fact that it is expressly provided by Statute that the land certificates of tenant purchasers should be handed over to such tenant purchasers, will he explain why the Land Commissioners impound the certificates and decline to hand them over as directed by the Act of Parliament?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Copies of the certificates are furnished to the purchaser, and the originals are retained by the Land Commissioners for the reasons stated at length by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the 24th of July, 1896, in reply to a Question addressed to him by the hon. Member for Cork City. I beg to refer the hon. Member to that answer, to which I have nothing to add.

ARMY HORSES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a Commission has been recently dispatched to Argentina for the purpose of purchasing horses for the British Army; whether these horses could be as cheaply purchased in Ireland; and whether, having regard to the promise of the War Office authorities to give preference to home-bred horses, this order will not be repeated, and Irish horses purchased instead?

MR. BRODRICK: A small number of horses required for South Africa will be purchased in Argentina. Their cost when landed at their destination will be less than one-half of that involved by purchasing them in Ireland, and they will be older horses. Preference is always given to home or colonial horses when they can be obtained without serious loss.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Has my right hon. Friend considered the question of purchasing horses in Australia?

MR. BRODRICK: That question has been considered, but, the distance being equally great, the cost would have been double what it would have been for horses from South America.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to state the exact number of horses to be purchased?

MR. BRODRICK: I think it is 450.

PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENCE (POSTAGE).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether, in view of the large surplus available principally for postal reforms, he will consider the advisability of recommending that all letters posted from the House of Commons during its sittings by Members of Parliament be sent post free, as the present arrangements entails a large tax on most Members for purely Parliamentary correspondence?

*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The Act 3 and 4 Vic. cap. 96 expressly abolished the privilege of franking which Members of Paaliament had previously enjoyed. I see no good reason why it should be revived even in the modified form suggested by the hon. Member. There is a special and practical objection to that suggestion—that the Postmaster General would have no means of knowing what letters were for purely Parliamentary correspondence.

COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND.)

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the amount of fees imposed as fines and recovered by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, under Section 6 of the Local Loans Act, 1892, and the number and amounts of the loans recovered by ordinary process by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland for each of the five years ending 31st March 1897.

*MR. HANBURY: The amount of fees imposed and recovered by the Board of Works under Section 6 of the Public Works Loans Act, 1892, was:—

Year.	Fees. £	s.	d.
1892–3		14	9
1893–4	40	8	5
1894–5	121	12	1
1895–6	195	16	4
1896–7	712	17	5

These figures of course can only refer to loans granted *after* the passing of the Act. The numbers of half-yearly instalments recovered in each of the same years were respectively:—

	£
1892–3	49,882
1893–4	51,364
1894–5	53,638
1895–6	59,564
1896–7	62,000 approximately,

(the number of loans being in each case half the number of the instalments). And the total amounts so recovered were—

	£
1892–3	733,044
1893–4	707,245
1894–5	783,374
1895–6	764,732
1896–7	757,883

These figures, however, include loans granted *before*, as well as those granted *after*, the passing of the Act. To separate the two would take very great time and trouble, but the total amounts recovered in respect of loans granted after the passing of the Act are roughly estimated to be as follows:—

	£
1892–3	1,000
1893–4	23,000
1894–5	50,000
1895–6	76,000
1896–7	132,000

In the latter year, as I have already stated, the amount of Fees imposed under the Act was £712 17s. 5d. The Fee being one shilling on every pound more than a month in arrear, this amount represents arrears of more than £14,300 out of a total of £132,000 recovered, or considerably over 10%. The large increase of the amounts received from £76,000 in 1895-6 to £132,000 in 1896-7 is due to the Seed Loans of 1895, amounting to about £65,000, repayable in two years; and as I have already explained in reply to previous Questions, interest on these loans is payable not by the localities but out of the Irish Church Fund, so if the Fees were not enforced, there would be little inducement to the localities to repay the loans.

SCIENCE AND ART SCHOOLS (GRANTS).

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (1) at what date the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Grants to Science and Art Schools, as adopted by the Committee of Council, are to take effect; and (2) whether the Science and Art Directory will henceforward be laid upon the Table of the House for one month before it comes into force?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The recommendations of the Committee are at present being considered by the Committee of Council. The Committee of Council do not consider that the course suggested in the second paragraph would be advisable.

WEIGHING OF CATTLE (SCOTLAND).

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he receives, in virtue of the provisions of Section 3 of The Markets and Fairs (Weighing of Cattle) Act 1891, from the five scheduled cities in Scotland satisfactory weekly Returns of the prices of live stock sold therein; and, if so, whether he is prepared in terms of Subsection (2) of Section 3 of the said Act, for the information of the large number of farmers in Scotland who have erected cattle-weighing machines at their farms, and who are selling their fat cattle to butchers direct instead of sending them as formerly to the auction marts, to publish these Returns, or abstracts thereof, weekly instead of quarterly as at present, in the same way as is done by the Board of Agriculture in regard to the average price of British grain?

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): Yes, Sir; I do receive fairly satisfactory returns, but there is still room for improvement. I cannot, however, adopt the suggestion in the last part of the Question.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, (1) whether, having regard to the fact that for the year 1896 there were 8,076 cases in which the telegraph was used merely for giving notice of withdrawal from the Post Office Savings Bank, the withdrawal Order itself being sent by post, will he state the average cost to the depositor of each such withdrawal; and (2) having regard to the fact that for the year 1896 there were 94,477 cases in which the advice authorising payment was sent by telegraph, will he state the average cost to the depositor in each of these cases of withdrawal in which, in order to have payment authorised by telegraph, he had to pay for two telegrams?

*MR. HANBURY: The answer to the first Question is 9d., and to the second 1s. 3d.

PARISH COUNCILS (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the amended regulations under which telegraph extensions may be provided under guarantee, he will state when he expects to introduce the promised Bill which will place parish councils in Scotland on the same footing as similar councils in England in regard to guarantees.

*MR. HANBURY: I hope to introduce a Bill containing this provision within the next few days.

PUBLIC WORKS (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate (1) whether his attention has been called to a resolution moved at a recent meeting of the Ross-shire County Council by one of the leading supporters of the Government in the county, and unanimously carried, in which it was declared that the Council views with astonishment and dismay the reduction of the Vote for public works and communications in the Highlands by over £10,000; and (2) whether, in view of the fact that the stoppage of harbour works (such as Bayble) which have already cost the promoters considerable sums of money, and which have been promised by the Scottish Office, will be productive of very great hardship to the promoters, he will make some provision under which those works, which have already been entertained at the Scottish Office, may be proceeded with without delay?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second portion of his Question the hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that any harbour works have been stopped for which promises were given. He is aware that the cost of such works after being entertained by the Scottish Office must be sanctioned by the Treasury—who have not seen their way to make provision for these works this year.

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether any steps have been taken to free the harbour of Port Ness, Island of Lewis, from the huge concrete blocks which fell into the harbour during the construction of the harbour works; and whether he is aware that these blocks are a serious source of danger to the fishermen in the pursuit their calling?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I am informed by the engineers of the works that the blocks referred to have not been removed owing to the weather not yet being suitable for doing so. They also assure me that the blocks are not a source of danger to the fishermen.

TELEGRAPH OFFICES (PUBLIC GUARANTEE).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the proposed reductions in the guarantees for telegraphic extension will be made retrospective to relieve guarantors in places where telegraph offices have not paid working expenses?

*MR. HANBURY: The concession to be made will apply to existing guarantees. The form which the concession takes is that the Exchequer will share the loss, if any, equally with the guarantors. It will come into operation on Jubilee Day, and will from that date apply to both future and existing guarantees.

POST OFFICE (DELIVERY OF LETTERS).

MR. ARTHUR JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, under the new regulations for the delivery of letters to every hamlet and house, due care will be taken that no delay shall occur in the present delivery of letters to the various villages and houses in the rural districts?

*MR. HANBURY: In the endeavours which are to be made to extend the delivery of letters to every hamlet and house in the kingdom care will, of course, be taken to maintain as far as possible all existing facilities, but the Postmaster General cannot pledge himself that, in the multiplicity of re-arrangements which will become necessary, no place or house shall in any case be served in the least degree later than at present.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESSES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a telegram addressed "Prime Minister, Natal," was refused on the ground of insufficient address at the Hammersmith Post Office on 8th May; and whether a telegram addressed to the Prime Minister of England would receive like treatment?

*MR. HANBURY: The telegram in question was not refused at the Hammersmith Office, but was duly forwarded to the Telegraph Company concerned. It was, however, returned by the Company with the request that if the telegram were intended for South Africa the name of the telegraph office might be inserted. A telegram addressed merely to the name of the country of destination does not comply with the regulations of the International Convention, which require that the name of the terminal telegraph office should be given. The regulations of the International Convention would apply to the Prime Ministers of England and Natal equally.

TELEGRAPH CHARGES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the telegraph officials at the West Strand Office on Saturday last insisted on charging "McCalmont" as two words; and whether these are the same officials who insisted on charging a person last year "bonheur" as two words?

*MR. HANBURY: I must ask my hon. Friend to postpone this Question, as the answer I have received from the Post Office is quite unintelligible to me. [*Laughter.*]

RATING ASSESSMENT.

MR. FINCH-HATTON (Notts, Newark): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, the rateable value of a tenement having been reduced in the autumn of one year at the quinquennial valuation, the said reduction to take effect on 6th April of the ensuing year, a vestry or other rating authority is entitled during the ensuing year to demand rates under the old assessment, on the ground that the rates for the whole year are fixed in the month of March previous to the reduction taking effect, notwithstanding that the said rates are payable quarterly, the result being that rates are demanded during a period of 18 months on a rateable value which has been declared excessive?

MR. CHAPLIN: The new valuation list comes in force on 6th April and only affects rates made after that date. The quarterly instalments payable in respect of a rate made in the preceding March must therefore be based on the valuation in force at the time the rate was made. There is only one exception. If the rate made in March was made on the rateable value as fixed by a provisional list, and that value is more than the value fixed by the new list which comes in force in April, the amount of rate overpaid is to be repaid, and presumably any unpaid instalments are to be diminished accordingly.

POST OFFICE (GRATUITIES TO POSTMEN).

MR. FINCH-HATTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that postmen have been forbidden by the authorities of the General Post Office to ask for Christmas boxes, without any compensation being given to them for the loss thereby entailed; and, whether it is the case that Christmas boxes have hitherto always been officially recognised as part of the wages of postmen?

*MR. HANBURY: I am of course aware that postmen have been forbidden in future to ask for Christmas boxes, and that their witnesses complained strongly before the Tweedmouth Committee, of the indignity which asking for Christmas boxes imposed upon them. I am also aware that in the provinces it has hitherto been forbidden to ask for them by printed card or letter, and that the London and provincial postmen are now for the first time brought under the same regulations. The Committee did not anticipate that to forbid solicitation would lead to any considerable diminution in the amount of Christmas boxes received from the public, and it is a fact that, although parcel postmen have always been forbidden to solicit Christmas boxes, they nevertheless receive them, although no old custom of giving to them could exist in their case as it does in that of the letter postmen. When the hon. Member speaks of compensation he is, perhaps, not aware that the Christmas boxes are by no means equally distributed among even the letter postmen, and that, while the juniors receive little or nothing on some walks, the seniors receive very much more than their share. Any system of compensation would in any case therefore be very difficult to carry out.

But with the advantages given by the recommendations of the Committee, which have been accepted wholesale by the Treasury, the postmen, so far from losing, gain considerably. It is not the fact that Christmas boxes have been officially recognised as part of the wages of postmen.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, if the managers of a school join an association under the conditions set forth under the Voluntary Schools Act, and such managers afterwards withdraw from the association, their school would continue to receive special grants at the same rate as when the school was represented in the association, providing the necessity of the school remained the same; and, whether, if the managers of any school decline to join an association when it is first formed, the association could refuse to admit representatives of such managers at any subsequent date if the managers then desire to join the association?

SIR J. GORST: The Committee of Council cannot lay down a general rule applicable to all the hypothetical cases suggested by the hon. Member. Every case would have to be considered on its merits and with reference to the special circumstances.

*MR. MELLOR (York, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Council whether his attention has been called to the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury in Convocation, in which he advises the Bishops and Clergy to proceed to divide the country into ecclesiastical districts for the purposes of association under the Voluntary Schools Act; and whether he is prepared to sanction such a scheme?

SIR J. GORST: Under the Voluntary Schools Act it is for the managers, and not for the Education Department, to initiate proposals for areas of association. The Education Department are prepared to, as stated in the minute of April 19, consider proposals as to areas made to them by bodies of managers which comply with the conditions.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS.

MR. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that in January 1896, the Local Government Board for Ireland sent a notice to the Local Government Board for England suggesting a committee of inquiry regarding the deportation of paupers from England to Ireland; (2) whether he is aware that the Local Government Board for England replied their willingness to nominate a member to serve on proposed committee of inquiry; and (3) whether he can state what steps the Local Government Board of Ireland have taken to carry out their part in the inquiry suggested?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The reply to the first and second paragraphs is in the affirmative. The proposal was to form a Departmental Committee, consisting of an officer to be nominated by the Local Government Boards of England, Scotland and Ireland, but the proposal fell through as the Scottish Board did not see its way to appoint a representative to act on the committee.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

MR. HUDSON KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether postal employees will receive a whole or partial holiday on 22nd June; and whether it will be possible at least to suspend all mails after the first delivery, and close telegraph offices after 10 a.m. as on Sundays, so that postal employees may participate in the general holiday.

*MR. HANBURY: June 22nd will be a Bank Holiday, and the ordinary Bank Holiday rules as to leave will apply. As regards the suspension of mails and the closing of telegraph offices, the arrangements will be the same as on ordinary Bank Holidays. Generally speaking, only one mail will be received and one dispatched. The telegraph offices will, as a rule, be kept open as on ordinary days to meet the convenience of the public, but the less important offices in towns will be closed as far as possible. Rural post offices at which telegraph business is not transacted will be closed at noon.

MR. F. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, considering the few opportunities the inhabitants of the East End of London have of seeing the Colonial and Indian troops, whether arrangements could be made during Jubilee week to march the Home, Colonial, and Indian troops, with their bands, through the principal thoroughfares of the East End of London, say from Whitechapel to Victoria Park, returning by way of Bethnal Green and Shoreditch?

MR. BRODRICK: It is intended to give as much opportunity as possible to all classes to see the troops collected for the Jubilee; but no arrangements can at present be made public.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (York, N.R., Thirsk): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is his intention to propose any, and if so what, arrangements as to the attendance of Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's Church or elsewhere on Sunday the 20th of June at a Thanksgiving Service in celebration of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have to say that, after consultation with Mr. Speaker, and after obtaining such information as I could, it seems quite clear that, acting on the precedent of 1887, we ought to have a service on the Sunday preceding Jubilee Day. ["Hear, hear."] With regard to the details, I have been in consultation with Mr. Speaker, and I can at present only say that in all probability the broad precedent set in 1887 will be followed on the present occasion.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he thought the service should be held before June 20, seeing that a large number of Members would then be out of town, and whether it would not be more convenient to have the service on the Sunday following. [Cries of "No, no."]

MR. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) asked whether June 20 was not a peculiarly appropriate day, as being the actual date of the Queen's accession.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: Probably June 20 would be the most convenient day.

SIR ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the authorities who have arranged the route for Her Majesty's forthcoming procession on the 22nd June, have considered the facilities which could be afforded to Naval and Military pensioners, as well as to sailors and soldiers on the active list, for viewing the procession, if the route were slightly altered so as to pass Wellington Barracks; whether they have considered that the configuration of the ground adjoining Birdcage Walk forms a natural stand for spectators on foot, whereas the ground adjoining the Mall is lower than the roadway and is ill adapted for enabling more than one or two rows of spectators to obtain a view; whether, since no stands are to be permitted in St. James's Park, any inconvenience or disappointment could be caused to anyone by the alteration of the route; and whether, since the distance from Whitehall and the Horse Guards Parade, via the Foreign Office, or Birdcage Walk to Buckingham Palace is not appreciably longer than that by the centre Mall, he is prepared to consider the practicability of such alteration, and, should it be found practicable, to recommend it?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): In answer to the hon. Baronet I have to say that the route of Her Majesty's procession on the 22nd of June has been settled for some time and cannot now be changed.

MR. MACNEILL wished to know from the First Lord of the Treasury whether there was any foundation whatever for the statement, which had been very definitely made that morning, that the Sultan of Turkey was sending his son to take part in the Jubilee proceedings [*ironical Ministerial laughter*], and, if that were so, who had given the invitation?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I know nothing about it.

MR. MACNEILL said he would repeat the Question to-morrow.

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he will arrange for a Copy of the Supplemental Commission, now being acted upon by the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund, to be laid before Parliament at an early date?

Mr. BRODRICK: I have laid on the Table this day a copy of the Supplemental Commission.

NOTIFICATION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES ACT.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board how many local authorities have adopted the Notification of Infectious Diseases Act, and what proportion that number is of the whole number empowered to adopt it?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Excluding London, where the notification of infectious disease is compulsory under the Public Health (London) Act 1891, the Local Government Board have, up to May 11th, 1897, received information of the adoption of the Infectious Diseases (Notification) Act 1889, in 654 rural districts out of a total of 671 rural districts, and in 904 urban districts out of 1,088 urban districts. But in 49 of the 184 urban districts where the Act of 1889 has not been adopted the notification of infectious disease is compulsory under provisions in local Acts.

CASHEN RIVER, BALLYBUNION.

Mr. MICHAEL FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that great injury has been caused to property and land adjoining the Cashen River, near Ballybunion, during the early part of March last by the overflowing of the Cashen River; whether he is aware that this is a frequent occurrence; and whether, owing to the very high taxation on the people of this district, some relief will be granted to them?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I am informed that early in March the River Cashen overflowed its banks, and that similar overflows have previously taken place. I have no reason to believe that the injury caused by the floods was extensive. It does not appear to be a case calling for the assistance of Government.

WATERFORD, DUNGARVAN, AND LISMORE RAILWAY.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will now state, for the information of the guaranteeing ratepayers of Waterford County and City who have a larger financial interest than the Treasury in the Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway, what company or companies are negotiating for the purchase of that line?

***Mr. HANBURY**: No, Sir; any negotiations are of course confidential.

TELEGRAPH OFFICE (DUNGENESS).

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that the Telegraph Office at Dungeness has recently been placed in the house of the agent of Foreign tug owners, and, having regard to the suspicion thus aroused in the minds of British tug owners and others that this gives advantageous priority of information to their foreign rivals, if the Postmaster General will take an early opportunity of considering whether it would not be better to have the office removed to a more neutral location?

***Mr. HANBURY**: The Postmaster General is aware of the fact mentioned by the hon. Member, but he has received no representations on the subject from British tug owners. When he decided to extend the telegraph to the house in question, he had every assurance that the sub-postmaster would act in strict accordance with his duty and he sees no reason to remove the office.

COUNTY COUNCIL (ACCOUNTS).

Mr. EDWARD STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, referring to their circular letter of the 29th March, 1889, whether sufficient experience has now been gained, since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1888, to enable them to prescribe the form in which the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of County Councils shall be kept?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The Local Government Board have prescribed a form of financial statement for County Councils, which has served as a basis upon which the County Council have modelled the accounts of their receipts and expenditure, and uniformity in the system of keeping the accounts generally has to a great extent been secured by the action of the District Auditors. The form of accounts with respect to the administration of the Technical Instruction Act is less settled than other accounts of the County Councils, and I am advised that it is expedient that some further experience should be obtained with regard to this branch of the accounts before an Order is issued. I may say, however, that the question of the issue of an Order will not be lost sight of.

TELEGRAPH POSTS (YEOVIL).

MR. STRACHEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, why no reply, except formal acknowledgments, has been sent to letters dated the 24th June, 14th August, 21st October, 11th November and 10th December of 1895, and 20th February 1896, from the Town Council of Yeovil in reference to certain telegraph posts on a road within the area of that borough; and whether, in view of the danger and obstruction caused to the public using this road, which is the main thoroughfare between the two railway stations of the town, the Postmaster General will assent to the request of the Town Council, contained in their letter dated the 24th June, 1895, and take immediate steps to remedy the present dangerous condition of the road caused by the telegraph posts standing out in some cases from six to nine feet from the side of the road?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General much regrets to find that through an oversight the result of the Inquiry which was at once instituted with reference to the request of the Town Council of Yeovil in their letter dated the 24th June, 1895, as to certain telegraph posts on a road within the area of the borough, was not communicated to the Council. The request was to the effect that the wires should be placed underground; and it was found that the circumstances did not justify the Department in acceding to it. The poles affected stood at that time in the banks or margin of the road, out of the way of traffic; but it may be that, owing to alterations which have since taken place in the road, the case is now different; and the Postmaster General, as soon as he received notice of the Question, gave instructions for further immediate inquiry, and ordered that steps were to be taken to set right anything which might be found to constitute a source of danger or obstruction.

SCOTCH HERRINGS (ST. PETERSBURG).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether, in view of the special facilities which the Russian Government is reported through Her Majesty's Ambassador, Sir N. O'Conor, to be making for the acceleration of the landing of Scotch herrings at St. Petersburg, he will again consider the expediency of approaching the Russian Government with a view to a reduction of the duty on herrings imported from Scotland, as recommended in the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on February 2nd.

CRETE.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is proposed to continue the blockade of Crete now that the Greek troops have been withdrawn?

*MR. CURZON: Although Colonel Vassos and some other officers have left Crete, the Greek troops have not yet been withdrawn. Arrangements are, however, being made for the removal of a first batch of 400. The question of the continuance of the blockade is under examination by the Admirals; and there can be no doubt that, as soon as it is found to be unnecessary, they will at once suggest that it should be raised.

MR. DILLON: Are we to understand, then, that the question of raising the blockade is to be left to the Admirals?

*MR. CURZON: No, Sir, the hon. Member is to understand nothing of the kind. The question will of course rest for decision with the Governments, but they cannot act until they have received the views of the Admirals.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Cretan refugees from Candia and Canea who are now in Greece are free to return to their homes; and whether, if they do so, the forces of the Powers now in occupation of those towns will guarantee their safety?

*MR. CURZON: The Cretan refugees from Candia and Canea have always been free to return to the Island, and there would probably be no objection to the return to Canea of those who have homes in that town; but so long as the Mussulmans who have been driven by the Insurgents from their homes in the interior are kept penned up in Candia by the Insurgent forces, they are likely to oppose even by force the return of the Christians to the houses in the town abandoned by them, and since occupied by Mussulman refugees. The forces of the Powers now in occupation are not sufficiently numerous to guarantee the prevention of bloodshed in such an eventuality. It will be necessary to allow time for some arrangement to be made for the return of the Mussulmans in Candia to their homes before the Christians who have left that town can with safety come back.

MR. DILLON: Do I understand that the refugees from Canea can return with the assurance that their lives will be safe?

*MR. CURZON: Of course it is not for me to give any assurance of that kind. The information, however, which we have received from the Admirals and Consuls leads us to think that the return can be safely carried out.

GAMBLING RAID (HULL).

SIR SEYMOUR KING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that last month the police made a raid on the "Prince George" public house in High Street, Hull, and arrested a number of persons on a charge of haunting and frequenting for the purpose of gaming, among whom were some working men who had entered the bar a few minutes previously to the arrest, and were subsequently discharged, no evidence being produced against them by the police; whether he is aware that these men were marched through the streets by the police to the station, searched, and detained in custody from shortly after three in the afternoon until enlarged by the magistrate on bail on the next afternoon, bail being refused although two magistrates were prepared to offer it, and subsequently had to appear twice at the Police Court, losing in all three days' work; whether he has been informed that the cases of these men have created general indignation in Hull and throughout Yorkshire; and if he is prepared to recommend that they shall be compensated for the loss to which they have been subjected?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): My attention was first called to this case by the hon. Member's Question, and I have no information at all of its having excited a general feeling of indignation in the county. It has been impossible for me to obtain a full report of the facts, but I have no reason to doubt that they are, substantially, as stated in the Question. The arrests, however, were effected on a warrant granted by the police magistrate, and the police court having risen for that day, there appears to have been no power to admit the accused to bail. I am afraid this is not a case in which I could grant any compensation from any fund under my control.

REVENUE (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any steps are being taken to ascertain the true revenue paid by Ireland and Great Britain respectively, in regard of articles which are consumed in one country and the duties on which are collected in the other; and, whether any steps are in contemplation to ascertain such true revenue, especially in respect of those articles which can be removed from one country to the other without official permit?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): No steps have been taken in the direction indicated by the right hon. Gentleman, and none are in contemplation, beyond the continuance of the returns as to the financial relations between England, Scotland and Ireland, which have in recent years been presented to Parliament. With regard to the adjustments of collected revenue made in those returns, I am advised that the figures relating to spirits are certainly, and those relating to beer probably, as accurate as they can be made. As to the other dutiable articles of consumption, notably tea, the figures cannot, I admit, be regarded with the same confidence. But no satisfactory means have yet been devised whereby greater accuracy could be obtained, without establishing such a watch over the movement of dutiable articles as would seriously hamper trade. Only one member of the recent Commission gave any countenance to such a suggestion. The proposed Commission will have before them the figures presented to their predecessors, and it will be open to them, if they are not satisfied with those figures, to suggest any practicable means for improving the basis on which the adjustments are made.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS (INDIA).

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what has been done with reference to a memorial on the subject of the preservation of ancient monuments in India, which was presented to the Secretary of State for India on 13th July, 1894, on behalf of the Royal Academy of Arts, the Society of Antiquaries of London, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and the Royal Archæological Institute; and, whether he will lay upon the table of the House the correspondence which has taken place regarding this memorial?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The Memorial cited in the hon. Baronet's question was forwarded in April, 1894, to the Government of India for their consideration. I am not aware what measures, if any, the Government of India have taken in consequence of the suggestions which it contains, but I will inquire, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member. At present the correspondence cannot be regarded as complete, but, when it is so, I will consider whether papers can be laid on the Table.

Chancellor of the Exchequer.

SALT DUTY (INDIA).

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that there is a very general feeling in India that the high duty on salt should be reduced for this year at least, in view of the sufferings of the poorer classes from famine, the loss of revenue caused thereby being included in the cost of famine relief; whether he is aware that such reduction can be effected by an executive order of the Government of India; and, whether he will direct the Government of India to issue such an order?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I am not aware that there is any general feeling in India that the salt duty should be reduced for one year. I may, on the contrary, point out that any such limitation of the period of reduction would be practically impossible, because, if an abatement for one year only were announced, enough salt for consumption during a very much longer period would undoubtedly be drawn out of bond or otherwise passed into stock within the year. The price of salt is now for the majority of the peeple of India lower than it was 20, 30, or 40 years ago, and the incidence of the duty is about 4½d. per head per annum. In these circumstances, although I feel most deeply for the sufferings which a large number of her Majesty's Indian subjects have been and are undergoing, I do not propose to issue any orders with regard to the salt duty.

ESTATES RETURN (IRELAND).

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether the first return of estates, under Section 40 of the recent Land Act has yet been printed; and, if not, why not?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: The Return in question was laid on the Table on the 6th instant, and was ordered to be printed. It will, I hope, soon be circulated. The printing of the Return rests with the Stationery Office.

IRISH ACTS (CODIFICATION).

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he is now prepared to state what the Irish Government propose to do in the matter of consolidating the Statute

Law so far as Acts applying to Ireland are concerned; and whether his attention has been drawn to the observations made by the Lord Chief Baron in the recent case of Barrett *v.* Harold as to the unsatisfactory condition of the Irish Poor Law Code in this respect?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: My attention has been called to the report of the Judgment of the Lord Chief Baron as published in the *Freeman's Journal* of the 7th inst., which contains no reference to the subject of codification. I have only to repeat the answers I gave to the hon. Member on the 21st and 22nd of January last in reference to this Question. The whole matter is still under the consideration of the Irish Government, but I cannot promise any legislation on the subject this Session, the more especially as several hon. Members from Ireland have announced their intention of raising controversial questions such as those relating to the Poor Law and Municipal Franchise and Rating on every available opportunity.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Am I to understand that the Irish Government admit no responsibility for the Government of Ireland?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: I don't wish the hon. Member to understand anything of the kind.

MATABELELAND AND MASHONALAND.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Pembroke and Haverfordwest (General LAURIE), I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of Imperial and Colonial troops employed in suppressing the insurrection in Matabele and Mashonaland, what number respectively of Imperial troops were killed in action, wounded in action, and died from other causes; whether it is intended to recognise the gallantry shown and arduous service rendered by the troops engaged by the issue of any decoration; and whether he is able to state the total number of white settlers murdered in Matabele and Mashonaland during the insurrection?

MR. BRODRICK: The forces comprised 1,230 Imperial and 1,492 local troops. The casualties from all causes among the Imperial troops were 14 officers and 39 men. The Chartered Company have been granted permission to issue a medal for service in the campaign. The white settlers murdered or missing were, according to a return furnished by the Company, 258.

VETERINARY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick (Mr. W. FIELD), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended this Session to give the promised grant in aid of establishing a Veterinary College in Dublin; and, whether he is aware that the charter has been ratified and guarantors secured, and that the governors are anxious to avoid further delay?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No grant-in-aid out of voted moneys was, so far as I am aware, ever contemplated or proposed for the establishment of a Veterinary College in Ireland. I have no funds at my disposal which could be utilised for this purpose otherwise than by legislation, which would certainly not be of a non-contentious character. The establishment of a Veterinary College would, in my opinion, be a matter proper for the consideration of a Board of Agriculture, such as it is proposed to create in the Bill now before the House.

BLACKROCK TOWNSHIP COMMISSIONERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick (Mr. FIELD), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why the Treasury, through the Board of Public Works for Ireland, require a fine of about £1,752 in consideration of accepting from the Blackrock Township Commissioners repayment at three months' notice of the outstanding balance of their loans (amounting to £12,084) instead of receiving that repayment by instalments spread over a number of years, pursuant to the literal terms of the mortgages under which these loans were obtained, and which do not contain any such condition as that which the Board of Works are now seeking to impose; and, whether this is a condition introduced recently and since the Blackrock Township Commissioners borrowed any of the sums of money which they now seek to repay?

Mr. HANBURY: The sum mentioned is in no sense a fine, but merely the difference between the par value and the current market price of the Local Loans Stock. The Blackrock Commissioners have borrowed from the Board of Works, within the last nine years, various sums which it was distinctly stated in the mortgages, as the question admits, should be repaid by periodical instalments spread over 15 to 50 years. They ask to be allowed to break these contracts at a cost of nearly 15 per cent. of the capital value to the lenders—the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. In the case of all loans, whether in England, Scotland or Ireland, it has been the rule of the Treasury since the end of 1895 to protect the taxpayer by refusing to allow premature repayment at a price far below the market value of the stock.

LOUGHSHINNY PIER (CO. DUBLIN).

Mr. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co. N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the pier at Loughshinny, county of Dublin, has now for several years been left but half built; and whether any steps are to be taken, and if so, when, to complete that structure, an excellent foundation for the unfinished part of which already actually exists?

Mr. HANBURY: Prior to 1886 there existed at Loughshinny, County Dublin, only the ruins of a very ancient pier about 400 feet long. In that year the Fishery, Piers and Harbours Commissioners made a grant of the then available balance of the Sea Fishery Fund, namely, £1,899, together with a local contribution of £276 for the construction of a pier 120 feet long and of a boatslip and platform. These works were completed, and handed over to the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin in 1888. No proposal is before the Board of Works for increasing the length of the pier, nor have they any funds available for such a purpose.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

BALBRIGGAN HARBOUR.

Mr. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the condition of Balbriggan Harbour, which is such that if the harbour is not soon dredged it will become useless; and if so, whether he will use his influence with the Treasury in favour of a grant being made for the purpose of clearing it out?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention does not appear to have been previously directed to the condition of Balbriggan Harbour, which, I am informed, is under the control of the Dublin Port and Docks Board. I could not, under the circumstances, recommend the Treasury to give a grant for the purpose of dredging the harbour.

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS (SCOTLAND).

Mr. C. B. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate when the Annual Local Taxation Returns (Scotland), 1894–5, will be published?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: I am informed by the Local Government Board that the proofs of the Local Taxation Returns have now been received from the printers, but that the Memorandum and Summary is not yet quite ready. The matter will be pressed forward, and it is hoped that it will not now be long before the complete volume for 1894–5 will be issued.

POSTMEN (CORK).

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, could he explain why it is that Cork postmen are placed in the same scale of payment as the postmen of Limerick and Waterford, cities of only half the population, and in a lower scale than the postmen of several English cities with half the population; how many and what English towns and cities with a lower population than Cork are placed in a higher scale than that city; and whether there are any English cities and towns with the same population as Cork which are placed in the same scale?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General has received a memorial for better wages from the postmen at Cork, and as stated in a letter sent yesterday to the hon. Member, the subject is now under careful examination. A further communication shall be addressed to him as soon as possible. At such short notice the information desired by the hon. Member cannot be given to-day.

START BAY (REMOVAL OF SAND).

MR. F. B. MILDMAY (Devon, Totnes): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the action of the contractors for the naval works at Devonport in removing large quantities of sand from the shores of the Start Bay; whether he will hold a local inquiry upon the allegations as to damage to fishermen's cottages and to the fishing industry likely to result therefrom; and whether he will in the meantime prevent further action of the kind?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): The shores of Start Bay referred to by the hon. Member are under the control of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Woods and Forests, who have granted the contractors a licence to remove materials therefrom—but, at my suggestion, a provision was inserted in the licence to enable it to be determined at three months' notice. I will communicate with the Commissioners and cause inquiry to be made as to the likelihood of damage being caused by the removal of the sand.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GRANT).

MR. A. J. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Committee on University Colleges has reported on the allotment of the increased grant; and, if so, whether he is able to inform the House as to its future allocation?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The Committee has not yet reported, but I expect it will shortly do so.

ORDNANCE SURVEY (CO. MAYO).

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he could state when will the maps of the revised survey of the county of Mayo be all completed and published; of what parts of the county of Mayo will maps be published on the 25-inch scale; whether maps on the 6-inch scale will be also published for the whole county; and will maps of Ireland for the future be in every way brought up to the same standard as the English and Scotch maps?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I understand that the maps will be presented in the course of the Session.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

MR. JEFFREYS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when he will introduce the promised Bill for the amendment of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I have been in consultation with my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board on this subject and I am afraid I cannot fix a day at present.

MIDWIVES' REGISTRATION ACT.

MR. WALTER HAZELL (Leicester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the Midwives' Registration Bill now waiting its Second Reading in this House; whether he is aware that the Bill carries out the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the subject, and that Bills with this object have been introduced time after time into Parliament, but that they have been dropped through failure to secure parliamentary time; and, whether in view of the large amount of mortality and widespread suffering both of mothers and of infants which the Committee report, the Government will give time during the present Session for the discussion of the Bill now before the House; and, if this be not possible, whether they can hold out hope of its being made a Government measure next Session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The hon. Gentleman asks me to give special facilities for the discussion of a private Bill. Without venturing to offer an opinion on the merits of the Bill, I must say this is a course the Government can hardly take at the present period of the Session.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION (SCOTLAND).

MR. T. C. H. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to introduce a Measure dealing with the subject of Private Bill legislation in Scotland?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: As perhaps the hon. Gentleman is aware, the Secretary for Scotland is now introducing the Bill in the House of Lords.

MR. HEDDERWICK asked if the right hon. Gentleman would undertake that the Bill should be introduced in this House in time to enable it to have a fair chance of passing into law before the end of the Session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: That would depend upon the general course of public business, with regard to which I cannot make a statement at present.

WALLACE BEQUEST (MANCHESTER HOUSE).

MR. W. F. B. MASSEY-MAINWARING (Finsbury, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the lease of Manchester House has been purchased by the Government; whether Lord Portman has been asked to sell to the Government the freehold of Manchester House; whether he has stated that, under certain circumstances, he is prepared to present the reversion of Manchester House to the Nation: and whether the Wallace Collections will be arranged in time so that the numerous Colonial visitors during the Jubilee week will have the opportunity of inspecting the said collections?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: As my hon. Friend is aware, a Committee has been appointed and is, I believe, actually sitting in connection with the course to be pursued as to this great public bequest. Until that Committee has reported I can hardly reply to the major part of the Question. I am informed with regard to one paragraph, however, that it would not be possible to throw the collection open to the public in the course of the next few weeks.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) asked whether there was any probability of the Committee reporting before the close of the present Session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I have not made special inquiries, but I should anticipate that they would report before the close of this Session?

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been drawn to a memorial by a large number of artists and others to the Education Ministers, praying that the completion of the South Kensington Museum frontage may be commenced; and if so, whether he will endeavour to procure the necessary funds for this purpose from the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: There is a Committee of the House investigating certain questions connected with the South Kensington Museum, and though it was quite true the primary object of that Committee is to deal with structural alterations or additions, I think we can hardly settle upon a plan dealing with the structure, seeing that it might require modification in consequence of the recommendations of that Committee.

MR. MUNDELLA asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, when he was last in office, plans were not called for by competition, a plan actually decided upon, and instructions given to proceed?

MR. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) inquired whether the late Chancellor of the Exchequer did not absolutely promise a grant to commence the building? ["Hear, hear."]

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he must have notice of the Question put by the hon. Member for Islington. He was not acquainted with the facts the right hon. Gentleman had brought before them, but he would be surprised that the right hon. Gentleman's account was accurate, as during the three years he was in office nothing was done. [*A laugh.*]

GRECO-TURKISH WAR.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I do not know whether the First Lord of the Treasury can give the House any information as to whether an armistice has been arrived at between Greece and Turkey?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir. I am afraid that I have no information to convey to the House. I did get private notice from the right hon. Gentleman a little after Five o'clock, but I know that he is very particular that an identic statement should be made in both Houses, and in order that that may be obtained I must have an opportunity of consulting the Foreign Secretary. On this occasion I have not had that opportunity. [*Laughter and cheers.*]

MR. J. MORLEY: I may say that I did not at all expect or ask the right hon. Gentleman to make an identic statement, but I should have been glad if he could have given any statement at all on a subject which is of great interest to the House and to the public. ["Hear, hear!"]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. J. MORLEY asked the Leader of the House what the business was for next Thursday—whether the Budget would be taken—and also whether it would be convenient for him to take the South African Vote on Friday, the 21st?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I cannot give an absolute pledge as to Thursday, but I think it is very likely that the Budget will be taken. With regard to Friday week, I shall be very glad to meet the right hon. Gentleman's wishes, which, I understand, are the wishes also of the Leader of the Opposition and of the House generally. The South African Vote shall be put down first for that day.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) supposed that the Finance Bill would not be taken before Thursday.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he could not even give an absolute promise on that, but he thought it unlikely.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) asked whether the second reading of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill was absolutely fixed for Monday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY replied in the affirmative.

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked if there was any intention of taking Supply to-night?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said that if they got as far as Supply he should propose to take it.

MR. WEIR desired to know whether the First Lord was now in a position to make any statement with regard to the introduction of the Bill for the congested districts of the Highlands and islands of Scotland?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he had no statement to make on the subject at present. He desired to add to his previous answer on the subject that in no case would the Finance Bill be taken to-night.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked if the right hon. Gentleman had any statement to make with regard to the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he had not.

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.—[No. 208.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. —[No. 208].

Bill, as amended by the Standing Committee, to be taken into consideration upon Wednesday 30th June, and to be printed.—[Bill 249.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.—[No. 209.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. —[No. 209.]

Bill, as amended by the Standing Committee, to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 250.]

MOTION.

POST OFFICE (SITES).

Bill to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire lands in London, Brighton, Norwich, Plymouth, Southampton, Oban, and Cork for the public service, and to confirm agreements in relation to the Aldersgate public garden or postmen's park; and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hanbury and Mr. Akers-Douglas; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 251.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

FOREIGN PRISON MADE GOODS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon), moved: "That the Bill be now Read a Second time." He said the subject was not by any means a new one to the House. In 1895 the matter formed the subject of Debate on the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Sheffield, "That it is incumbent upon Her Majesty's Government, in the interests of the industrial classes of the United Kingdom, at once to take steps t restrict the importation of goods made in foreign prisons by the enforced labour of convicts and felons." The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, who was then President of the Board of Trade, opposed the course proposed by his hon. and gallant Friend, and suggested, as an alternative to the Motion, the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the whole matter. The Debate showed very clearly that the House was not at all disposed to accept this alternative, and, in the result, the Motion was carried without a division. Thus the House of Commons, distinctly and without reserve, committed itself to the opinion that the Government should at once take steps to prevent the importation of these goods. The then Government, although they allowed the Motion to pass without a division, did not act either in the spirit or the letter of its terms. They did, in fact, the very thing which had been rejected by the House of Commons. They appointed a Committee, not, as had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the member for Aberdeen, of the House of Commons, but a Departmental Committee "to inquire into the extent to which goods made in foreign prisons are imported into this country and to report whether any, and, if so, what, steps can be taken effectually to restrict the importation of such goods." It seemed to him that that was deliberately setting at naught the Resolution of the House of Commons. [*Cheers.*] The Committee reported to the effect that the quantity of such goods imported was not such as to injure British trade generally; that the evil results were confined to the importation of Belgian and German goods; that mat-making suffered slightly, and that the brush-making trade as a whole did not suffer any serious or lasting injury. He had never stated that the importation of these goods was a very large importation, nor had he ever said that the importation was a serious injury to their trade as a whole. [*Opposition Cheers.*] When they assumed Office they felt that, in view of the Resolution of the House of Commons, it was necessary that some steps should be taken with a view of endeavouring to carry it out. They did that which was suggested as a possible course in the Report of the Committee—received after they had assumed Office—and endeavoured to put an end to the grievance. They entered into negotiations and addressed communications to the four Powers who were mainly interested in the matter—Holland, Belgium, France, and Germany—with the object of endeavouring to arrange for some common action to stop the importation of these goods. The reply from France was to the effect that steps had been taken to utilise prison made goods with a view of stopping, or at least of diminishing, their exportation. Belgium replied that they could not undertake to prohibit their exportation; Prussia that they were restricting the manufacture more and more, hoping ultimately to abolish it; and Holland that the amount was very small, and that they could not assent to an international agreement. Though there was no reason to express dissatisfaction with the sympathetic tone of the replies, it was quite evident that there was no prospect of putting a stop to the importation of these goods by means of international agreement. The Government then had to consider whether they were justified in ignoring the Resolution of the House, and, in arriving at a conclusion upon that matter, they had to consider what was likely to be the action of the present House of Commons upon the subject. ["Hear, hear!"] He certainly had no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that if the House of Commons of 1895 arrived at such a Resolution there was every reason to expect that the existing House of Commons would be even more in favour of such legislation—[*cheers*]—and that, therefore, it was the duty of the Government to endeavour to give effect to the Resolution. The practical conclusion at which the Select Committee arrived was that the grievance was a small one and that British trade generally was not injured. [*Ironical cheers.*] That, however, was no consolation to a particular trade which was injured. [*Cheers.*] The Government had never said that the grievance was a large one, having regard to British trade as a whole; but they agreed with what the Commissioner of the Department of Labour in the United States said, that the difficulty "did not lie so much in quantity as in the effect occasionally and here and there upon price." What the House was asked to legislate upon was the question of principle and not quantity. [*Ironical cheers.*] Hon. Gentlemen seemed to be inclined to think that a Bill of this kind would be of little use. That was not the opinion of Belgium. He saw the other day a copy of an influential Brussels journal in which the question of this legislation was commented upon. It was *Le Petit Bleu*, and this is what it said:—

> "Public opinion in this country is much occupied with this Measure, which may have a serious effect upon Belgian trade. Owing to the extreme cheapness of these goods, England has been the principal market for articles manufactured in our prisons, and particularly in our penal settlements. That market once closed to a trade of this particular kind, the latter will necessarily begin to raise a serious and even a disloyal competition against the regular trade of Belgium, and our free workers producing under less favourable conditions, we shall witness the decline of a whole series of interesting small industries. . . . But now that exportation is soon to become impossible, the whole weight of competition will fall upon Belgium. All the products which used to be sent to England will load the Belgian market; the free employer who pays a day's wage of from 2f. 50c. to 3f. cannot contend against speculators who run the workshops of the penal settlements and pay wages which never exceed 40 centimes a day."

Hon. Gentlemen who jeered apparently had no objection to disloyal competition between convict-made Belgian-made goods and English free labour. [*Cheers.*] The proposal of the Bill was to add prison-made goods to the table of goods which were prohibited. That was the course which they found adopted both in Canada and the United States. The Canadian law prohibited "goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labour or made in connection with any prison, gaol or penitentiary." The United States law enacted that "goods, wares, articles, and merchandise manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labour shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is prohibited." It might be said, and with some justice, that there would be difficulty in applying the law. On that point he had consulted the Customs authorities, and they informed him that there would be no difficulty in applying the law if sufficient evidence be produced. [*Laughter.*] If the Bill passed it would be the duty of the Government to instruct our Consuls at foreign ports carefully to watch with a view to obtaining such evidence. Even assuming that the difficulties would be considerable, the mere existence of this legislation and the risk of confiscation would act as a deterrent in preventing such goods being sent. But, whether that were so or not, he was satisfied that in placing it upon record that this House would not tamely submit to the importation of prison-made goods to compete with the free labour of this country the Government were giving effect not only to the views of the House of Commons but of the immense bulk of the people of this country. [*Cheers.*] He should very much like hon. Gentlemen who were now endeavouring to minimise this Bill and were going to oppose it to go to any meeting of the working classes in any part of the country and advocate the admission of convict-made goods. ["Hear, hear!"] He had no doubt as to what the result would be.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Who is to tender the evidence?

*Mr. RITCHIE: Who is to supply the evidence? Those people who have got the evidence to supply. [*Laughter and cheers.*] The Customs authorities will be prepared to receive evidence from anyone who will come to them with facts respecting any particular shipment of goods which arrive in this country.

Mr. E. ROBERTSON: They can only take action upon evidence tendered.

*Mr. RITCHIE: Certainly. For the reasons he had adduced he commended the Bill to the attention of the House, and he had no doubt hon. Gentlemen would find that the opinion of the House of Commons in regard to it was in accord with that of the last House of Commons and the opinion of the great bulk of the people.

Mr. J. H. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) offered the Government his congratulations that at last, after two years of office, they had been able to find time for the consideration of that social and labour programme of which they heard so much during the General Election, and so little since. They might also congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade on having performed a feat which he ventured to say was absolutely without precedent in Parliamentary history. The right hon. Gentleman, he supposed, was the first Minister who had ever asked the House of Commons to endorse a policy which a Committee appointed under the auspices of his own Department had not only declared against, but declared to be absolutely objectionable. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the courage he had shown in throwing over the men of tried experience and the public servants who had sat upon that Committee. But he must express his disappointment at both the time and the form of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the Resolution which the hon. Member for Central Sheffield passed during the last Parliament. He would remember that the whole allegation against the then Liberal Government during that Debate was that they would not at once stop the importation of prison-made goods. The difficulty of preventing the importation was pointed out, and the critics were challenged to say what their remedy was to be, and what was their reply? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), said:—

> "The thing is perfectly easy—give us the fees and we will give you the prescription."

Well, they had been in office two years, they had had the fees all that time, and this was the result. The statement then made that they had the prescription in their pocket appeared to have been a very fruitless one, for after they had been in office some time, it was found that the only prescription they had been able to use was a proposal to send post-cards to foreign Governments, and ask their co-operation. What did they ask the foreign Governments to do? They had the boldness, not only to ask them to deal with importations into this country, but also to set their own houses in order and stop the sale of prison-made goods even in their own countries—a matter which concerned them alone. The right hon. Gentleman must admit that the original intention of the Government had completely failed. The foreign Governments refused to co-operate, and the result was that the prescription of a bad doctor had to be set aside, and they had that night, not the prescription of the President of the Board of Trade, but the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Central Sheffield five years ago. Well, if anyone was entitled to congratulate himself that night, it was the hon. Member for Central Sheffield. Although the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had shown a warm affection for this Bill, he was not the real father—he was the step-father. The real legitimate father was the hon. Member for Central Sheffield, and he thought, after the progress the hon. Member had made in this matter, that any private Member might take heart and rest satisfied that, no matter how strong the opposition to his proposals might be at one particular time, he need never despair, if only he was persistent enough, of getting a Government weak enough to adopt his proposals. [*Laughter.*] Let them see what was the case presented in support of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman, he should have thought, would have come forward with some important statistics from his own Department: but what had he done? Instead of giving the House Board of Trade returns, he had given them a paragraph from an obscure Belgian newspaper. Well, he knew that the Government were in the habit of going to Germany and other places for other portions of their policy, but he was surprised that they should find it necessary to go abroad for a justification of this particular Bill. The right hon. Gentleman gave them no statistics in favour of the Bill, because there were none to give. All the statistics he could give would be against the passing of the Bill. But what did the right hon. Gentleman say about the Bill himself? He confessed that, while listening to the speech of the President of the Board of Trade, he wondered whether he was moving the rejection or the passing of the Bill. His whole speech seemed to be a speech against the Bill. Because what did he say? He said this was a grievance which was not large or serious.

*Mr. RITCHIE: What I said was that it was not large or serious relatively to the trade of the country as a whole.

Mr. DALZIEL: If the right hon. Gentleman said that, it was hardly necessary to say it at all—it was so obvious. The grievance was certainly not large or serious, as he should be able to show. The right hon. Gentleman laid the whole case for the Bill on the Resolution passed by the late Parliament. Of course, he was perfectly justified in taking that view, but it was a new departure for the Government of the day to base the justification of its policy on a Resolution passed at the fag-end of a long sitting. The right hon. Gentleman admitted there would be difficulty in applying the law, if passed. He was safe in making that admission, because it was absolutely impossible, in his judgment, to make the Bill effective as it stood at the present time. The right hon. Gentleman had failed to show that any particular trade was suffering from the importation of foreign prison-made goods. Why? Because he could not. They had heard a great deal about the brush-making trade. What were the facts as to that trade? Ten years ago 14,000 people were employed in the brush-making trade in this country. At the present time the number was 17,000—an increase of 20 per cent., while the increase of the population had been only 8 per cent., and the trade societies were as complete in membership as ever. These were clear proofs that the brush-making industry had not suffered. The importation of foreign-made brushes amounted in value to £40,000 a year. If they made a liberal allowance, and said that one-half of these brushes were made in prison, and took the cost of labour at one-third, they had a sum of from £6,000 to £7,000 as representing the whole question of importation in this trade. The leading brush manufacturers had testified that this question did not concern them in the slightest degree. They could make better brushes, and put them on the market at the same prices as those quoted by the agents for the foreign goods, and the trade was rapidly growing. Yet in the face of such facts they were asked to pass a Bill dealing with an imaginary evil by applying an impracticable remedy. In the mat-making industry, also, they found that there were more men employed than ever, while the unions, such as they were, showed a larger membership. In the face of facts like this, the Government had absolutely failed to make out any case for the Bill. Further, there had been no public demand for the Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman could have done so, he would have quoted resolutions by the dozen from all parts of the country. He doubted whether he could have mustered more than half-a-dozen. True, the Trades Union Congress did pass a resolution on one occasion in favour of the Bill—["hear, hear!"]—but that was some years ago. He did not think the resolution had ever made its appearance since, and he should be surprised, indeed, if the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Gentlemen opposite were going to pass the Bill upon that solitary resolution. So little interest was manifested that the mover and seconder of the resolution and the Trade Congress never replied to the letter from the Committee inviting them to give evidence. Advertisements were inserted in 12 of the leading papers of the country inviting people who suffered from the importation of prison-made goods to give evidence, and only two persons came forward. Subsequently advertisements were inserted in 19 provincial papers, and these only produced one witness. ["Hear, hear!"] But was the Bill effective for its purpose? Evidence was to be tendered to the Commissioners of Customs that goods imported had been made in a foreign prison. Who was to give the evidence? Did the Government expect the consumer to come forward and complain that he got his goods too cheaply, or that the Germans were taxing themselves for his benefit? After these goods had passed through half-a-dozen hands, how was anyone to prove that they were prison-made? And if it were proved, was it fair that the last holder, who might be totally ignorant of the origin, should risk forfeiture? ["Hear, hear!"] No firm in this country would waste time or money in sniffing after goods made in foreign prisons; and what an agreeable duty to impose on our representatives abroad! The only person whose interest it would be to give evidence would be a rival importer; and while his allegation (perhaps anonymous) was being inquired into, the goods would be kept back and trade would be disturbed. The evidence in the Merchandise Marks Committee showed that all these restrictions were decreasing trade, and the House ought to be careful how they multiplied such restrictions. ["Hear, hear!"] The whole case for this Bill was that the brush-making industry was suffering. But how could the Government stop there? Every trade which was injured by unfair foreign competition had the same claim to protection. Was foreign sugar or Argentine beef to be stopped because its producers received a bounty from their Government? If this Bill was not protection, what was? It was simply to compel the consumer to pay more for brushes in the interest of the brushmakers. He could understand the hon. Member for Central Sheffield supporting the Bill, because he wished to extend its restrictions to all foreign-made goods. But was that the view of the President of the Board of Trade? Or was the right hon. Gentleman only the companion in arms of the hon. Member for the moment only? ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman would find it very difficult to get rid of the hon. Member for Sheffield, to whom the passing of this Bill would be an encouragement to persevere. [*Laughter.*] The President of the Board of Trade did not rely so much on the operation of the Bill itself as on the fear which foreign Governments would have of it. It required a stretch of the imagination to conceive any foreign Government being afraid of this Bill. [*Laughter.*] No cause had been shown for it; it embodied a violation of the settled policy of the country for the last 50 years; and it did not achieve the object which the Government professed to have in view. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a bogus Bill [*cheers*]—brought forward, not in the interest of the consumer, but as a Party manœuvre to redeem pledges which ought not to have been made. [*Cheers.*] Its object was to tickle the ears of a certain section of the working classes in this country, who entertained a prejudice in this matter. [*Ironical Ministerial cheers.*] Surely it was not the duty of a strong Government to encourage a false prejudice; and it was not fair to take advantage of a depression in trade and induce working men to believe that it resulted from the competition of foreign prison-made goods. He begged to propose to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."

*MR. T. P. WHITTAKER (York, W.R., Spen Valley) seconded the Motion for the rejection of the Bill, because he regarded the Bill as an insidious attack upon the free trade policy of the country. ["Hear, hear!"] The real objection to goods made in prison was that they were cheap, and, being cheap, they competed with goods manufactured in this country. The fact that they were made in prisons did not matter at all. If the people of this country suffered from the importation of cheap goods, then cheapness was the evil, and it mattered not where those cheap goods were made. That the goods now in question were made in prisons was merely an excuse for an attack on the policy of free trade. If the principle of the Bill were carried to its logical conclusion the importation of all goods competing with labour and production in this country should be prohibited. Why not deal in the same way with jewellery, paper, toys, laces, silk goods, woollen clothing from Germany; French gloves; American and Swiss watches; glassware and prints? ["Hear, hear!"] It was no consolation to a man thrown out of work by the importation of some foreign article to tell him that that article was not made in a prison. The real grievance and difficulty was that the man was out of work, and, if that were a sufficient justification for the prohibition of the importation of goods made in prison, it was sufficient to justify the prohibition of the importation of all classes of foreign-made goods. ["Hear, hear!"] If the competition of imported goods was an evil everyone that suffered from it should be protected; but if it were not an evil, then no one should be protected from it. It might be said that the great objection was to foreign labour in prisons. He assumed that sweated labour on the Continent was more objectionable; and there was no proposed Bill to protect the working men of this country from that class of labour. ["Hear, hear!"] Again, if it was unreasonable to allow competition by the prison labour of other countries, it was just as unreasonable to allow competition by the prison labour of this country. Prisoners must be employed for their own benefit and, as a consequence, for the benefit of the community. The labour must be useful labour, for if it were otherwise it would be degrading; and, being useful labour, it must necessarily compete with the free labour of the country, even though the articles thus produced were not sold in the open market. If our prisoners produced something useful which would otherwise be produced by people outside, then our prison labour was competing with our free labour. But hon. Gentlemen opposite had not the courage to carry their principles to their logical conclusion. Again, if the importation of goods was to be forbidden because the conditions under which they were made were unsatisfactory, and little or nothing was paid for the labour employed; then carpets were made in Asia under very objectionable conditions, and they should prohibit the importation of articles made by our fellow subjects in India, where labour was paid at probably the lowest rate in the world. In fact, the whole principle of the Bill was unsound, and could not be defended from any point of view. He felt that this protective policy, this policy of interfering with trade, this policy of worrying industries at every stage had gone very much too far already. They had been making fools of themselves in connection with the Merchandise Marks Act. They had been advertising the foreign manufacturer too much. The mere passing of the Bill would be an announcement to the mat and brush buyers of the world that they need not come to England to purchase them cheaply, because those articles could be bought cheaper elsewhere. This policy of endeavouring to create work by keeping foreign-made goods out of the country was a great mistake. He contended that the importation of cheap articles was a benefit to the masses of the people of the country; and that it did not throw people out of employment. When the hon. Member for Central Sheffield moved a Resolution on foreign prison-made goods a few years ago he flourished before the House a foreign prison-made brush, which he said could be bought for sixpence, whereas if it had been made by English labour it could not be bought for less than a shilling; and the hon. Member argued that that was a very great injustice to the working men of this country. He ventured to assert that the importation of that brush to be sold at sixpence, which would otherwise cost one shilling, was a boon and a blessing to this country. If a man had to pay a shilling for a brush which he could get for sixpence, he would have sixpence less to spend on other articles. It was the common-sense teaching of experience that if they made an article dear it would be bought less frequently than when it was cheap. That would mean that there would be less employment for the people. He entered into an argument to show that the importation of those sixpenny brushes meant more employment for the people as well as the advantage of a wider use of brushes. The competition of prison labour was not, and never would be, serious. Prison labour was not cheap, it was dear; it was inefficient and not properly-trained labour. The evidence before the Committee on this point was conclusive, and the fact that the right hon. Gentleman could not bring forward any weighty statistics as to the injury which had been done showed that this was very largely an imaginary grievance. The competition of the free labour even of Belgium was far more serious than the competition of the prison-made article. The fact was it was the custom in this country for both employers and workmen to assume that an article was prison-made simply because it was cheaper than one that they could make. It was curious and interesting that this particular agitation had been set on foot by the European agent of an American firm. Evidence was given by brush makers before the

Committee to show that by the adoption of improved machinery they could produce brushes vastly cheaper than those made in foreign prisons. It was free competition that led to the adoption and use of machinery, and it was by the development of machinery and by inventions that we must look to maintain our position in the commercial world. It had been given in evidence that the brush trade of this country had doubled in volume during the last ten years, and that the number of people employed in the brush and mat industry had increased far more rapidly than had the population. The Committee, which had before it the evidence of experts, reported against legislation in this matter as being impracticable and useless, and it must be evident to everybody who read the Bill that it was an unworkable scheme which was proposed. In the result trade would be harassed. It was impossible to trace where goods came from except from information obtained by trade rivals spying upon each other, and such a system would not be reputable. The Custom House authorities could only be put in motion by other people. He asked the House to show some backbone with reference to our great Free Trade policy, which had done more to develop our prosperity during the last 60 years than anything else, and not to allow it to be nibbled away by litle Bills of this kind.

*SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) expressed his gratitude to his right hon. Friend for having taken this early opportunity of giving effect to the Resolution of the House of February 19, 1895. A very large proportion of those on that side of the House had at the General Election pledged themselves to do all they possibly could to give effect to that Resolution. It was true that the right hon. Member for Aberdeen on that occasion offered a Committee to consider the Resolution, a proposal which was received with laughter by both sides of the House. His right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham in the course of a very interesting speech said, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman:—

> "In presence of the universal demand from the constituencies, and an admission by the official head of the Department, we are asked to take a Committee. No, Sir; in that respect we are not the comrades of the hon. Member for West Ham."

Mr. T. P. Whittaker.

After upwards of two months' delay the right hon. Member for Aberdeen appointed a Departmental Committee to consider this matter, and, although he would not challenge the constitution of that Committee, he could only say from his experience of it that it was carefully selected from the right hon. Gentleman's point of view. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] After 13 witnesses had been examined, and after they found that they were unable by any means to hasten the proceedings of the Committee, Colonel Bridgeman and himself felt compelled to resign their membership of it. The Report which was subsequently made stated that two trades only, the brush and mat making trades, made serious complaint of injury; that in the case of the former trade the allegations were not sustained, and in the case of the latter the injury was found to be very slight. He did not hesitate to say that that opinion of the five Members of the Committee who so reported was not justified by the evidence which was given. The President of the Masters' Cocoa Nut Fibre and Mat Association, however, said: "Many of the former workers are in a state of destitution"; the President of the United Cocoa Nut Matting and Matmakers Society, "Half of the matmakers are now out of the trade, and can get no employment at all"; the Secretary of the Society of Operative Brushmakers, "Ruin practically stares us in the face"; Mr. Thornton, Progressist member of the London County Council, and brush manufacturer, "There is a strong feeling among, not only masters, but men, that the competition of foreign prison labour with free labour in England is unfair"; the Secretary of the Manchester Branch of the United Society of Brushmakers, "During the last three years the competition of foreign prison-made goods has been most severely felt, we only ask to be protected against criminals"; and the Glasgow Branch, "The brush industry of this country will be destroyed." Hon. Members might say it was only a question of the mat makers and the brush makers, but if they would read the report sent to the Government by Mr. Tower, second Secretary of H. M.'s Embassy in Berlin, who had made inquiry into prison labour in Germany, they would see that almost every trade was admitted to German prisons, and there was no industry in this country which, if not threatened, might not be threatened by this unfair competition in the near future. Speaking on February 19, 1895, in that House, the right hon. Member for West Birmingham said:—

> "What will happen in the brush trade is that nobody will be able to make a profit, no workman will get decent wages. The Germans have sent over to this country for models of English manufactures, that they may reproduce such articles in their prisons. At the present time they are thus making some 20 different articles, and when they have fully ruined the English trade in these, they, no doubt, will be prepared to go on with 20 others. The simple fact is that no industry will be safe so long as this state of things is allowed to continue."

What was true in 1895 was even truer now. The resolution of the Trades Union Congress, in denunciation of the importation of prison-made goods, had been referred to. It was the agitation of the Trades Unions against the unfair competition of prison labour with free labour which had led successive Governments to put a stop to the competition in English prisons, and he asked whether it was fair, right, or proper, when the labour in English prisons was stopped that goods made in foreign prisons should compete with free labour in England. The employment of foreign prisoners was no concern of ours; the employment of English prisoners did concern us. It was absolutely incumbent on the Government of this country, having stopped the competition of English prison labour with free labour, to protect English working man from unfair competition coming from foreign countries. As to the amount of the competition, the report of Mr. Towers, dated June 20, 1894, and presented to Parliament in January last, clearly showed that a daily average of 29,200 prisoners in Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, and the Thuringian States were employed in work which eventually reached outside trade, and that in Prussia alone 8,296 prisoners were employed in cigar manufacture, machine knitting, basket weaving and cane furniture making, cardboard work and fancy paper making, cocoa matting making, button making, lamp making, etc., wood carving, toy making, picture frame making, iron ware making, copper ware making, and miscellaneous factory work. In Germany the production of prison labour was not allowed to be sold within a radius of the prison of origin; and in Belgium it could not be sold so as to compete with free labour. The bulk of prison-made goods then came to England—the only market which condescended to admit them. Steps had been taken in the United States not to admit them there. With regard to the practicability of restrictive legislation and of enforcing it, Mr. Charles Follett, C.B., for 17 years Solicitor to Her Majesty's Customs, gave most valuable evidence on this head. He said:—

> "The prohibition of prison-made goods, if it were agreed upon, would be nothing new. There are several classes of goods prohibited. Prohibition is a long-standing thing. I should have no difficulty in drawing a Bill in the sense of my views supervised by the Parliamentary counsel. I should consider it a feasible and effectual way, as the best means of preventing these goods coming in, would be to require that prison-made goods should be prohibited, and that the classes of goods which are believed to be made in foreign prisons should be, from time to time, specified by Customs regulations with Treasury approval. I should not think it would put any serious drawback on trade. It would soon cure itself. Although my experience during the past 17 years has been in a certain sense theoretical and legal, I am in a position to know the practical working and carrying out of all Customs laws and regulations."

Surveyor General R. T. Churchill said:—

> "I have been nearly 40 years connected with the Out-door Customs Department, and I have passed through its different grades, examining and clearing goods. I am thoroughly acquainted with the administrative machinery. I have heard the evidence given by the solicitor to the Customs, and his general views as to the feasibility of drafting a practical Measure to prevent the importation of prison-made goods. I have no reason to dissent from any of these views. I generally concur. It is certainly my opinion that the importation of prison-made goods is injurious to the manufacturing and labour interests in this country, and should, in my opinion, be stopped if possible."

Therefore the remedy suggested by the President of the Board of Trade on behalf of the Government would go a long way to deal with the mischief. If the Bill did not go far enough its supporters could come to Parliament to strengthen it. The importation of foreign prison-made goods began in a small way and had gone on increasing. Some years ago the importation of foreign prison-made brushes was so small that the record of it was abandoned, but latterly it had increased 700 per cent., and the imports amounted to £40,000 a year. It was the duty of the House to take care of every trade and industry. The brush and mat trades were specially injured, and there was no reason why they should not receive protection. He earnestly urged every Member of the House to give his hearty support to the Bill. Although it might not be sufficient, at any rate it would do something to cure an evil which was recognised by the working men of every trade in all parts of the country, and he thanked the President of the Board of Trade and the Government for having done that which the late Government failed to do, and that was to give effect to the unanimous Resolution of the House of Commons in the last Parliament. ["Hear, hear!"]

On the return of Mr. SPEAKER, after the usual interval,

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman who last addressed the House complained of the delay of the late Government in this matter. He should have thought hon. Gentlemen opposite would have been wise to avoid that topic. The hon. and gallant Gentleman complained that the right hon. Member for Aberdeen caused a delay of two months, but the Government which the hon. and gallant Gentleman supported had been guilty of a delay of two years. He purposed briefly to show what the present Government had done in the matter. In the first place they entered into communication with four European Governments and the Government of the United States, suggesting that they should enter into an international agreement to exclude prison-made goods from both the home and foreign markets. That did seem to him to be a very wild-goose chase. That request was absolutely impracticable, and it would be unjust to the intelligence of the Government to suppose that they thought the other Powers would comply with it. However much two of those Powers might have been inclined to comply, there was a constitutional difficulty which would prevent them—he meant the Germanic Empire and the United States—in those two countries the question was a State question and not a Federal question.

*MR. RITCHIE said that that course was suggested by the Committee.

MR. PICKERSGILL said that was not the case. The Committee referred to the great practical difficulty in the way of carrying such an agreement into effect, and added that the question whether it should be encountered was for the Government and not for the Committee to decide. He did not think the action of the Government was altogether prudent, and in view of the answers they had received to their communications, he was surprised they should still consider it necessary to legislate. The answers received from most of the Powers were not only friendly in their tone, but as far as the main question was concerned, decidedly favourable. Then, Germany was not able to answer for all the States of the Empire, but the Prussian Government said that it was intended to restrict prison-made goods more and more, and that they hoped to abolish it entirely. He did think the Government ought to acknowledge the extremely friendly way in which foreign Governments had received the communications. They had agreed to act as our own Government acted with regard to prison-made goods. They would so use them as to do no injury to anyone. He should like to know how any hon. Member of that House could distinguish a case of prison-made goods from other goods. There was no intention on the part of any foreign Government to injure England, and grounds of complaint had been largely diminished, if they had not been entirely removed. Then he came to the Bill. He never saw a Bill drawn like this. The right hon. Gentleman had expatiated upon the moral effect of enacting the prohibition of goods made in foreign prisons. Why, this Bill did not prohibit such goods. ["Hear, hear!"] It prohibited goods which, by the evidence tendered, were shown to be made in prison. There was an unconscious humour about this for which he did not give the right hon. Gentleman credit. He did not think that a lawyer had drawn the Bill. He rather thought that it had the Birmingham mark upon it. How was proof to be given?

To the Customs Department, so that they could act upon it? They might prove that the original consignor used prison-made goods, or labour, but if he employed other labour outside for producing the same class of goods who could distinguish between the two? ["Hear, hear!"] How in the world could they distinguish a particular bale of goods as made by prisoners and not by free labour? This Bill did not at all carry out the recommendations made to the Committee. The hon. Member referred to Mr. Follett, but he was not responsible for this Bill. What Mr. Follett would have proposed was not that Bill. Mr. Follett proposed to throw upon the importer the duty of proving that the goods were not prison-made. That was the way in which a lawyer would draw a Bill, but this Bill proposed to do everything against which Mr. Follett warned them. They had the experience of the Merchandise Marks Act. Out of the thousands of cases which came under that Act very few indeed had been seized on information; not 1 per cent. He did not hesitate to say that this was a bogus Bill. [*Cheers.*] He did not believe that the Government thought it a workable Bill. It was like some Bills introduced into the Chamber at Washington which everyone knew were never intended to be acted upon. He would rather pass a bad Bill than a Bill like this, which the promoters knew would not be workable. As to prison labour, so long as they took care that it was spread over a number of industries it could not do any appreciable injury to the working classes, and he should be ashamed of the British workman if he disputed the right of the criminal to be employed. ["Hear, hear!"] It was wise, just, and merciful to employ the criminal in useful labour. They had been threatened with the resentment of the workmen if they opposed this Bill. He was not afraid of his constituents. He had a large constituency of working men, and he had not the least fear of offending them by voting against that Bill, because he thought the reasonable working man would see that this Bill was a sham, and that it was a red herring drawn across the track.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea), as the representative of a working-class constituency, maintained that if constituencies containing working men were consulted now, when trade was fairly good, and were not subject either to the cry of the unemployed or to the bogus plaint of designing politicians, who had no other claim to represent them than their capacity to draft bogus Bills and get up artificial cries about tooth brushes being made in Belgium and eye-glasses in Japan, he believed that even in Sheffield the hon. Member would lose his case by a proportion of 20 to 1. When, however, this question was mixed up with Home Rule, alien immigration and grants to Voluntary Schools, its effect was lost sight of, and the constituencies voted on the major question, while taking for granted the minor but not less important questions. He asked the hon. Member for Sheffield to give the date of the Resolution and the speeches when the Trade Union Congress voted in favour of this Bill. The only time when the question of prison labour was argued out on its merits was at Belfast in 1893. A Motion was made condemning the competition of British prison labour with British free labour; but the Resolution was opposed by men who represented some of the trades alleged to be claiming the passing of this Bill. The Motion was unanimously rejected by the Congress. He pointed out that under the Bill there would be great difficulty in detecting what were and what were not prison-made goods. Were the prison-made goods to be labelled? Goods made in prisons would be taken to the port from which they were going to be sent. They might be labelled, which he doubted; but long before they reached the port and were sent to this country the labels might be changed, and then it might be convenient for the free labour products to bear the prison label while the prison-made goods might be marked as made either in Belgium or Germany, but not as having been made inside a prison. The quantity of prison-made goods was indeed very small, not sufficient to warrant the introduction of a Measure like this, while the quality was invariably bad. The proportion of prison-made goods was diminishing. France was restricting it and confining it to hand labour; Belgium had pledged itself to have no machinery employed in the prisons; Germany had promised to confine it to non-competitive industries. He had visited 15 of the largest prisons in the United States, and there they were confining the prison trade to new non-competitive work. The United States prisoners were hired out to contract; they were not engaged in making the article from the raw material up to the finished state. On the ground of cheapness there was not much reason for the introduction of the Bill. If by the Bill the Government labelled or identified these goods, they affirmed to the English people the low-water mark of cheapness and dragged English competition down to the lowest possible limit, and by that means caused ruin to trade not only at home but abroad. If cheapness was the reason for the Bill, why did not the Government include corn, machinery, textile articles from India, and jute? The Government knew well that they dared not do this. Every workman in England, Belgium, or Germany would be only too pleased to know that the best way to get a man out of prison and to keep him in an honest path was to provide him with a decent means of employment in making useful articles, and that this was the best agency for reducing crime. But if the Bill was passed the tendency would be to restrict prisoners to the picking of oakum, in digging a hole here and filling it up there, to the punishment of the treadmill and to other demoralising forms of punishment. He had been in prison, and he knew quite well what would be the effect of this silly proposition in England if universally applied. It would mean that when masons were out of work and were clamouring for harbours and breakwaters to be made, the prisoners at Portland would have to be stopped from working. To its credit, England had stuck bravely to Free Trade; it had done so to such an extent that Lord Salisbury, who generally spoke straight—[*Ministerial cheers*]—stated the other day that any man who advocated a going back to Protection would be a fool. [*Cries of* "No!"] Well, if he did not say that, he implied it. But this Bill was an attempt to introduce the doctrine of Protection, and they had selected the trade of a people who were the least prejudicially affected by foreign competition.

*Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Is not trade unionism a protection of labour?

Mr. BURNS said that trade unionism was a protection of labour inasmuch as it demanded a living wage, a maximum number of hours, decent Factory Acts, and sanitary conditions, and over and above that it believed in fair play for a free people in the free production of interchangeable commodities. He did not believe the British workman feared competition to the extent alleged; certainly he did not in the mat and brush-making trade. And if that competition did prejudicially affect to the extent of demanding the attention and interposition of the House of Commons, he would ask that the interference should be applied, not to 300 or 400 men whose trade had not been diminished, but to half a million of men in the textile trades, three-quarters of a million of men engaged in the coal trade, half a million of men engaged in the engineering trade, and the million and a quarter of men engaged in agriculture. He never heard a weaker case presented by a Minister of the Crown on behalf of a Bill than that made out by the President of the Board of Trade on behalf of this Bill. If they wanted to employ the unemployed, let them do away with the pluralists, assimilate the Factory and Sanitary Acts, and apply them in India and all over the Crown colonies. Why bring in a paltry bogus Bill like this? This was a brutal and an inhuman Bill, a Bill which no one who had had the slightest experience of the treatment of criminals in this or any other country could justify. No doubt this House would pass the Second Reading. It seemed to him that this House was capable of committing any folly in the direction of Protection, though sometimes it had a lucid interval. It did happen that at times the constituencies were humbugged and chloroformed by Bills of this description, but he believed that when they thoroughly understood this Measure, their verdict would be that the Government wanted Protection, but had not the courage to apply it to every industry. A permanent injury had been done to British trade by the marking of foreign-made goods. This was a mischievous Bill, and on that ground he should vote against it.

Mr. CUTHBERT QUILTER (Suffolk, Sudbury) said that, as the representative of a large number of men engaged in one of the industries which it was sought by this Bill to protect, he cordially supported the Measure. He was as good a free trader as the hon. Member for the

Spen Valley Division, but that should not prevent him rising to say that the men whom he represented felt it was a hardship to them that mats and matting made in the penal colonies of Belgium should be allowed to be imported into this country without any restrictions whatever. The hon. Member for Battersea spoke strongly of the attitude of the Trade Union Congress upon this matter. He had had the honour and privilege of conferring with trade union leaders on this matter, and he was thankful to say that after eight or nine years' hard work, and with the cordial assistance and wise counsel of those leaders, he succeeded in impressing the then Government with the propriety of discontinuing the unfair practice of contracting with prison labour in our own prisons. The consequence was that his constituents and their wives and families were starving.

*MR. SPEAKER said he must remind the hon. Member, as he had reminded another hon. Member, that the question was not the employment of criminals in English prisons, but the importation of goods made in prisons abroad.

MR. QUILTER said he would obey Mr. Speaker's ruling at once, but would like to explain that he was going to point out that, having been a consistent advocate of their protection against prison labour in this country, it was quite natural he should press that position to its logical conclusion, and support the Government in now doing away with what they had found to be unfair in their own country. He could not conceive how any Gentleman, even on the opposite side of the House, could regard that to be fair in Belgium which was admitted to be unfair in this country. The result of the manufacture of these mats in the Belgian penal colonies was that the English market was flooded with them, and it was impossible for their workers to live. If the late President of the Board of Trade had been in his place, he would like to have reminded him of the many occasions on which he had brought this matter to his attention, and of the several occasions on which he said that if there was a case at all for this Committee, or for legislation on the subject, it was the case of the mat weavers, especially in the district he represented. It was said what a small affair this was in the whole trade of the country, but it was the day of small things. It was the people who attended to small things who won in the end. They had had too much legislation on a grand scale—too much interference with everybody's property, and too much upsetting of everybody's business. What they wanted was to put everything in order, and to try and undo, as far as they could, the mischief which had been done in the three years of the preceding Parliament. He thought it spoke well for the business-like qualities of the Government, and especially of the President of the Board of Trade, and the Colonial Secretary, that they had not thought it beneath them to try and remove the grievance of a small number of people. He thought the Bill should have received the support of the Labour representatives. The Labour representatives in Belgium were far more alive to the interests of their constituents than were the Labour Members in his country, for when they found out that these prison-made mats were underselling the free labour of that country, they put such pressure on their Parliament that they were obliged to take measures to stop it. He implored the Government to stand firm to the proposal they had made, and to do their best to see that the Belgian prison labour was treated in exactly the same way as prison labour was treated in this country. As to the carrying out of the Bill, he would deal with the question in a very simple way. He would put the onus on the importer. He would make him answerable for not selling in this country as free labour goods articles made in foreign prisons, and he thought that would very soon have the desired effect.

MR. E. ROBERTSON said he was inclined to think that the true defence of this Bill had yet to come. The authorship of the Bill had been imputed to the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield, and he understood he accepted the soft impeachment without demur. It had also been imputed to the right hon. Gentleman who introduced it, but there was another right hon. Gentleman on that Bench who, he imagined, would by-and-bye give the true defence of the Bill, and an explanation of it such as they had not yet had from that side of the House. The President of the Board of Trade convinced them that his heart, at all events, was not in the work he had to do. He was an old and experienced Member and Minister. He had had to pilot many difficult Bills in that House, and on many occasions he had distinguished himself by the success with which he had discharged his functions as Minister; but he had never heard him resort to such arguments as he had resorted to that night. His main argument in support of the Bill was that the Government was bound to obey a mandate, not of that House, but of the preceding House. He had never heard that before held out as a principle of Ministerial action. Why, a Motion carried by a private Member on a Friday night was by universal consent of the Leaders treated as one which might be ignored. If the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues were going to accept as mandates all the Resolutions passed by the last Parliament they would have their hands full. The President of the Board of Trade gave himself away at the very beginning by admitting that the grievance, if any, was a small one. The right hon. Gentleman's chief piece of evidence was a quotation from a Belgian newspaper of which he never heard before. What was the date of the article?

*MR. RITCHIE: March 15.

MR. E. ROBERTSON asked the question because he could not gather from the extract that the writer had ever seen this Bill or was referring to it; if he was he was very easily alarmed. There were two main questions—Was this thing worth doing at all, and secondly, was this the way to do it? On the first question he was not a bitter opponent of the principle—[*Ministerial laughter and cheers*]—whether as against home prison or foreign prison produce he had no great objection to ordinary, free, non-criminal labour being protected. But the language of the President of the Board of Trade was very different from the mighty thing made of this grievance by the Secretary of State for the Colonies last year, and by every Unionist candidate at the last election.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Will the hon. Gentleman kindly quote the words in which I made a "mighty thing" of this last year?

MR. E. ROBERTSON: I refer the right hon. Gentleman to his whole speech. [MR. CHAMBERLAIN: "Oh!"] I appeal to those who heard him that I am not giving an unfair account of the speech. [MR. CHAMBERLAIN: "I deny it!"] One of the right hon. Gentleman's expressions, as reported in the "Parliamentary Debates," was:—"There is no industry which is safe if this thing continued." [*Cheers.*] Was not that making a mountain out of a molehill? [*Cries of* "No!"] That sentence was characteristic of the whole speech. The main question, however, upon which comparatively little had been said was—Was this the right way to do it? Goods proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs by evidence tendered to them, to have been made or produced wholly or in part in any foreign prison, gaol, house of correction, or penitentiary, were to be added to the table of restrictions and prohibitions in Section 42 of the Act of 1876. This addition was entirely out of line with the category therein set forth. In every prohibition in that category, a plain, imperative duty was laid on the Commissioners of Customs. But here the Commissioners of Customs were to take no action unless they were set in motion by somebody who tendered evidence to them that the goods had been made in prison. He invited the hon. Member for Sheffield (Sir H. Vincent), who was the father of this whole legislation, to consider the sham his Leaders were palming off upon him. How the Commissioners were to satisfy themselves, what the procedure to be adopted—all this was left *in nubibus* in the Bill, and he declared that to offer such a thing as this Bill to so loyal a supporter of the Government as the hon. Member for Sheffield and his hon. Friend below the Gangway was to play upon their credulity. If they were to have these things prohibited, they should be prohibited in some effective way. Something might be said for the plan of the hon. Member below the Gangway, but for this proposal to be made by a strong Government which condescended to deal with small things was an experiment that ought not to be made. The Bill had been well described as a bogus Bill—a sham Bill. Apparently the Government were willing in this case, as they had not been willing in more important things, to accept Amendments; and while he did not approve the Bill in its present shape at all, if it was carried through the Second

Reading he should certainly consider himself free to strengthen the back of the right hon. Gentleman by withdrawing this condition about tendering evidence, and putting upon him and his subordinates the duty and responsibility of prohibiting goods when they came within the prohibition clause. ["Hear, hear!"] They now had the prescription for which they had waited two long years. Was that a policy—that? [*Laughter.*] Goods were to be prohibited, not because they were prison-made, but because evidence might be tendered which might prove to the satisfaction of the Commissioners for the time being that they were prison-made. It was a policy that was not worth the name. He did not know whether this was the prescription of a regular practitioner or not, but it was a prescription that would justify one in applying strong epithets to the author, and if this was all they had to expect from a Government of social programmes on a matter which was regarded as of so much importance two years ago, then the sooner the House was up the better. [*Opposition cheers.*]

MR. T. H. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) did not desire to say much in support of the Bill. But there was one argument which appeared to him to be very strong indeed, and which the right hon. Gentleman had not dealt with. Why, if our own prison-made goods did not compete with our own free labour goods, should we admit the labour of convicts abroad to compete with free labour in this country? Was not the Government justified, nay, compelled to take these steps? Was not the Bill the logical consequence of the steps taken by Mr. Matthews to prevent our own prison-made goods competing with free labour goods? The right hon. Gentleman said there had been no defence of the Bill from the Front Bench. He ventured to say there had been no attack upon the principle of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman himself had made no attack upon the principle of the Bill. He seemed to him to be rather a weak and faint-hearted supporter of the principle of the Bill; but he had not the courage of his opinions like his hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield had. [*Laughter.*] Well, he did not know why the right hon. Gentleman the ex-President of the Board of Trade expressed such derision; and he hoped that before the Debate concluded they would hear why. That this Bill was of considerable importance to the country was, he thought, admitted by all hon. Members opposite. The hon. Member for Battersea, he thought, had said that party capital had been made of this, and nearly all the hon. Members who had spoken on the other side had spoken in a similar sense. How could party capital be made out of a Bill if the people of the country took no interest in it? He ventured to say this was a subject in which the constituencies, in which the working classes had and did take a very great interest. Even if only a few of their number were affected, they stood together and had a fellow feeling—["hear, hear!"]—and even if only a small and isolated body of brushmakers were injured by the competition he ventured to say that the whole of the working classes had a feeling of sympathy for them. If that was the case he did think that the Front Opposition Bench had shown a spirit of singular indifference to the importance of this Debate. The right hon. Gentleman, one of the Presidents of the Board of Trade in the last Administration, made in 1895 a most valuable contribution to the Debate; and said in the course of his speech that it was only natural and reasonable that the working classes should feel aggrieved when their free labour came into competition with foreign convict labour. Had the right hon. Gentleman nothing to say now? He ventured to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he did not intend to take any part in this Debate. The country would certainly remark, if he did not, upon the absolute indifference shown by the two men on the front Opposition Bench best qualified to form an opinion on the subject, viz., two ex-Presidents of the Board of Trade. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. J. SAMUEL (Stockton) as one of the representatives of a town where brushes were made, accepted the challenge of the hon. Member who had challenged any one representing the working classes to take part in the Debate. He thought that the Gentlemen who pleaded for the Bill should give the House some statistics to show to what extent the importation of foreign prison-made goods affected the trade of this country. If they took the brush trade, no one who had read the evidence contained in the

Report presented by the Committee some time ago could avoid coming to the conclusion that so far as the brush trade was concerned, the evidence was not conclusive in favour of the theory that the importation of foreign prison-made brushes affected in any way the trade of this country. It was stated by almost every brushmaker who gave evidence before the Committee that, as far as the best brushes were concerned there was no decline in the manufacture in this country. As to the cheaper brushes, there was the evidence of the representative and part owner of the Star Brush Company, which had the bulk of the business in such brushes, and of Mr. Page, representing a large Norwich firm, that in supporting the agitation against these prison-made goods, the workmen of this country were on the wrong scent. During the four months ending April 30th, 1896, we imported £59,000 worth of brushes, while during the same period we exported £38,000 worth. As to mats and matting, during four months of 1895 we imported £25,000 worth, and exported £16,300 worth. The table presented by the Customs showed that out of £25,000 worth of mats and matting imported, no less than £18,331 worth came from China and Japan. Therefore, in that period only £2,800 worth of mats and matting was imported from Holland and Belgium, and during that same period we exported to Holland and Belgium £2,277 worth. The importation of prison-made goods could not be checked without enormous expense in obtaining evidence. There was astounding evidence before the Merchandise Marks Committee that since the passing of the Merchandise Marks Act the transhipment trade of the country had been deeply affected. This week a representative of the shipowners had stated that the interference with packages by the Customs was prejudicially affecting our shipping trade; and such a result would injure far more workmen than could possibly be concerned in the competition of foreign prison-made brushes. He thought that the House ought to have further evidence that this Bill would effect its object.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.), who was received with Ministerial cheers: I share the surprise of my hon. Friend the Member for Ayrshire that we have not heard anything in the course of this Debate from the representative of the Department chiefly concerned in the time of the late Government. I do not forget the very important Debate in 1895, in which the right hon. Gentleman examined the whole question very carefully, and I admit that I am surprised that he has not thought it worth while to give the House the benefit of his opinion, and to tell the House whether, like the whole of his followers, he has completely turned round in the course of the last few years. [*Laughter and cheers.*] I am well aware that we must not make too great demands on the Front Opposition Bench, and that we have already had a speech from the hon. Gentleman who represents the Opposition on so many occasions. The hon. Member for Dundee always speaks on matters connected with the Navy or with foreign affairs; and now he has undertaken the work of the Board of Trade. [*Cheers and laughter.*] And it may be said, in the absence of his Leader, that the hon. Member for Dundee is the representative of the Leaders of the Opposition. [*Cheers and laughter.*] I have personal reason for desiring to magnify the office of the Civil Lord of the Admiralty—[*laughter*]—and I congratulate my hon. Friend the present Civil Lord of the Admiralty—[*renewed laughter*]—upon the greatness which is in store for him when the Government of the day is again changed, and when the hon. Member will have to answer for all our affairs. [*Laughter.*] I have said that this Debate is remarkable as showing a most extraordinary and at present unexplained change of front. For what happened in 1895? In February 1895 a Motion was made calling attention to this grievance, and demanding that the Government should at once—the words "at once" were purposely inserted in the Resolution—[" hear, hear! "]—proceed to deal with the importation of these prison-made goods. The right hon. Gentleman who then represented the Board of Trade did not complain of the Resolution, did not deny that a grievance was established, and did not deny that a remedy was necessary. But he plainly said that, having consulted with his officials, he was unable to find a remedy, and that he would be extremely pleased if the Opposition furnished him with something practical in that way. Then, as soon as he heard that the Opposition could not assist him in that direction, he proposed the appointment of a Committee, which we had reason to believe would take a long time to conduct its investigations, and would lead to no definite or satisfactory end. ["Hear, hear!"] We refused the offer of the Government. It was refused by my hon. Friend the then Mover of the Resolution; it was refused by myself, who was then an independent Member of the House and the Leader of a small section of the House; and it was subsequently refused by my right hon. Friend near me (Mr. Balfour), then Leader of the Opposition. That was a direct challenge to the Government. [*Cheers.*] We refused their offer; we insisted that they should deal with the matter in a practical spirit. What did they do? Did they divide against us? Not a bit of it. [*Cheers.*] In the first place, they tried to count us out. [*Laughter and cheers.*] I have said there was a singular inconsistency on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite. They are at least consistent in this, that to-night they tried to count us out again. [*Laughter.*] Having failed to count us out on the former occasion, they challenged a Division on our Amendment, but when the time came to divide—in the meantime there had been communication between the Front Bench and the Benches below the Gangway—there was no one to call out "No," and accordingly our Resolution was carried *nemine contradicente* in February, 1895. But afterwards, the then Government, instead of complying with the Resolution, acted in direct disobedience of it by appointing a Departmental Committee, which certainly was not considered satisfactory by those who had supported the Amendment, and which had the effect of delaying the matter until after the general election. ["Hear, hear!"] Up to that period the Government, as I have shown, had admitted, but avoided, their obligations. But now it is entirely different. Here is a Bill to carry out an obligation which has been unanimously supported by the House of Commons, and yet Member after Member gets up on the other side of the House in order to show that the grievance is imaginary, that the evil does not exist, or that if it does exist it ought not to be remedied. [*Cheers.*] And for this extraordinary change of views and action there is no explanation whatever, except it be the fact that in February, 1895, we were within a month or so of the General Election, and that now, in May, 1897, hon. Members opposite think the General Election is very far off indeed. [*Cheers and laughter.*] But that is not all. This matter has not been allowed to drop even within the period of office of the present Government. The hon. Gentleman who has now moved the rejection of this Bill got up during the discussion on the Address at the opening of last Session and denounced the Government for not attempting even to fulfil their pledges, and among the pledges to which he gave prominence and importance, as a matter of serious obligation, as a matter to which the greatest attention ought to be paid, but which the Government had neglected, was this very question of prison-made goods. [*Laughter and cheers.*]

Mr. DALZIEL: If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me. I was on that occasion inquiring for information. [*Ministerial laughter.*] The Government on that occasion were pledged to do something, and it seemed as if they were not going to do anything. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Of course we perfectly understand the hon. Gentleman's desire for information. [*Laughter.*] When we attempt to carry out the promises we have given, it is declared that the Measures we propose to pass are absolutely unworthy of the support of the House; but if we do not bring forward Measures to fulfil our obligations and pledges, we are told they are matters of the utmost importance, and we are denounced for not bringing them forward. [*Laughter and cheers.*] We understand these tactics very well, and are fully satisfied. [*Renewed cheers and laughter.*] But here is a fact which I wish the House to notice, and which I am sure the country will notice. Here is this Measure, and here is a broad issue. In February, 1895, we all appeared to be unanimous in favour of it. That is no longer the case. I want to emphasise that fact. [*Cheers.*] Hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot go down to their constituencies and pretend that they are in favour of the exclusion of prison-made goods. [*Cheers.*] I do not suppose that even they, for very shame, would dare to run away from the question once more. [*Laughter.*] They must take a division upon it. [*Ministerial and Opposition cheers.*] We are grateful to them for having given us the opportunity of separating—what shall I say?—the sheep from the goats. [*Laughter.*] Now we know what is the value of their support of a Measure in the immediate anticipation of a General Election. [*Cheers.*] The fear of a General Election being now removed from them, they oppose as bitterly and as strongly as they can the very Measure to which they had previously given their assent so far as its principle is concerned. [*Cheers.*] At all events, we are satisfied with having the opportunity of redeeming the pledges we have given. [*Renewed cheers.*] Hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot say after this Session that we have disappointed our friends, or that we have been false to our pledges. I undertake to say that at the end of this Session, after two working Sessions, we shall have fulfilled a larger part of our programme than any Government have ever done before. [*Loud cheers.*] And this, although confessedly it was one of the minor Measures of our programme, is not a matter of that very small importance that the hon. Gentleman opposite seems to think. He will find that it will grow in importance as time goes on. [*Laughter.*] I feel perfectly certain that as soon as the next General Election is in sight, the hon. Member will begin to think that this is a matter of paramount importance. [*Laughter.*] The hon. Member for Dundee, referring to a speech I made in the House before the last General Election, said I declared it was a most significant Measure. I said nothing of the kind. In every instance in which I referred to the matter—and I did refer to it in the course of the General Election—I pointed out that in itself it was a small matter, that it was of small economical importance. In this House, however, I pointed out that it was a matter of great political importance. [*Cheers.*] Yes, and hon. Members have reason to thank me that they took my advice then. ["Hear, hear!"] My advice, given frankly, was that this was a matter to which constituents attached very great importance, and that they would be wise to remember that, and that if they did not remember it we should. What was the result of that frank statement? I did not conceal it; I took advantage of it afterwards. But I gave them the information, and as a result none of them dared to vote against the Resolution. [*Cheers.*] Now, I say, we are justified, having fairly warned our opponents, in taking advantage of the extremely bad strategy which they have exhibited this afternoon. They have actually given this little Bill a more violent and more strenuous opposition than they have given to any other Measure of the Government, except the Primary Education Bill. Very well, all I hope is that they will stick to this line of policy—["hear, hear!"]—that they will on every platform of the country call attention to their magnificent action tonight—[*laughter*]—to the opposition which they have offered to this Bill for preventing the importation of prison-made goods, and that they will upon that demand the further confidence of their constituents. [*Laughter.*] If they do demand that, I hope they may get it. Now, Sir, I have said that I have never exaggerated the economic importance of this matter, but at the same time as a matter of principle it is of very considerable importance, and as a matter of fact it is of enormous importance to a small number of people, and when it is a question of justice, a small number of people have quite as much right to be considered as a large number. Just let us see what is the fact. We are told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that they admit there is a certain amount of public feeling in this matter. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley, I think, said that that was the case, that there was a prejudice among the working classes against having to compete with, and losing their employment in consequence of, the unrestricted importation of goods made by foreign convicts, principally Germans and Belgians. He admitted that, but he called upon us to sacrifice ourselves in the great cause to which he himself is a votary, and show our courage by disregarding public opinion. Well, Sir, that advice comes from a queer quarter. [*Laughter.*] Why did not hon. Gentlemen opposite pay disregard to public opinion? Why did we not have all these admirable economic arguments at the time of the General Election of 1895? Why did not the hon.

Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs tell us that free trade was in danger on that occasion? He never opened his lips. All this, therefore, must either be new information, or, as I have suggested, hon. Members opposite think the circumstances have changed and that they have still time to repent. I have said that, although it is not a gigantic evil, neither is it an imaginary evil. What is the fact? The fact is this—that these goods made in foreign prisons and imported into this country compete especially with the brush trade and the mat trade, two minor trades, and that they also compete to a less extent with a considerable number of other trades; and, further, that, if they are not restricted by legislation, we have it on the authority of some German speakers and politicians that it was the intention of the authorities in Germany to spread the industries in the prisons over a larger number of trades, so that we do not know what trade may not ultimately be affected. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee, who gave the effect of a speech which I believe he had not heard, and refused to quote any language which justified—

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg pardon; I listened to every word of the speech.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: In 1895?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes; to every word of the speech.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I can only say then that the hon. Gentleman's memory is defective. [*Laughter.*] But when challenged to produce proof of the statement that I have described this matter to be of extraordinary importance as an economical problem, he quoted as my statement that there was no industry which was safe as long as this state of things was allowed to continue. What was the "state of things?" He did not quote the context, because the speech was only handed to him at the moment, and he had not time to make himself acquainted with it. It was that the then President of the Board of Trade, the right hon. Member for Aberdeen, had explained, as a reason for minimising the evil, that the Germans were benevolently going to extend the process to a great number of other trades.

*Mr. J. BRYCE: No, I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: This is what I said on that occasion, and the right hon. Gentleman being present took no exception to it:—

> "The right hon. Gentleman made an admission. He said that the Germans had spread these prison industries over as many manufactures as possible."

*Mr. J. BRYCE: Certainly.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN:

> "What a satisfactory state of things! How admirable it will read in the newspapers tomorrow! The right hon. Gentleman will be enabled to go to Aberdeen and say to his fellow-citizens there:—'At the present time the Germans in their prisons have not dealt with the jute manufactures;' but a member of the audience will say:—'Oh! but you say that the Germans have spread their prison work over as many industries as possible, and how do you know that the German prison system may not spread even to our industry?'"

[*Cheers.*] And it was imputed to me, in reference to what I said as to the state of things described by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, that I said that, under those circumstances, no industry would be safe! Now, Sir, I say that it is quite true that a very considerable number of industries might really be affected if this principle were unrestricted. But some of the hon. Members opposite have argued that this cannot be a matter worthy of any consideration on our part because prison labour is not cheap. I think it was the hon. Member for Battersea who said that. What an extraordinary ignorance of the state of things that argument shows! In what sense does the hon. Member say that prison labour is not cheap? Of course it is not cheap if a book of profit and loss were kept by every prison, and if a prison conducted its affairs as a private firm does, and opened capital, and interest, and depreciation accounts, and went into the actual cost and everything else. Of course it would not pay to make brushes in prisons in that case. But when practically it does not cost anything because you already have prisons, and do not pay for them, and when everything you get for a brush is profit except the cost of the raw material, then prison labour is by the necessity of the case the cheapest of all labour, and prisons can afford to make goods at what would be a loss to others. We employ prisoners, as the hon. Member for Battersea has said, in making breakwaters, or for work of that kind; but of course it has been found by comparison with ordinary labour to be the most extravagant business possible. At the same time it would be perfectly possible for us to hire out these men at 4d. a day, and the profit would be 4d. a day, although the expense, because of the article manufactured, would be very much more than the cost under ordinary systems of trade. There is no doubt about it, and it is useless for the hon. Member or anyone else to deny it; they do not wish to know where the shoe pinches, but the people engaged in these industries do. They know perfectly well, and it has never been contradicted, that this particular trade has been injured; not merely that the amount of the trade has been diminished, but the profits of the industry altogether destroyed; and it means also that wages are reduced and the workers put in an unfair position. The hon. Member for Battersea says, "Why do not you deal with any other trade?" I defy him to find any other trade in the same position. What is the case here? You have actually by Resolutions in this House prohibited prisoners in this country from working on this productive industry. ["Hear, hear!"] Do let the House bear that in mind when we are dealing with such arguments as those put forward by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley. The hon. Member for Battersea asserts that criminals should be taught an industry and make goods which will be afterwards sold. Why then does he not, to be consistent, propose that prisoners in English gaols should be allowed what they are not now allowed to do—compete with British industry?

Mr. BURNS, interposing, said the right hon. Gentleman was entirely mistaken. The Government did not prohibit British prisoners from competing with free labour to the extent he represented. What the Government, to its credit, did was to confine the employment of prison labour to certain areas.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Out of 18,000 prisoners in gaols 300 are employed on work of a kind which comes into competition with free labour. In Germany and Belgium all prisoners are employed on productive work, and this is not allowed to be sold in Germany. It is ear-marked for consumption in this country. [*Cheers.*] I said "in Germany," I should have said "in these foreign countries." This is what is said by the Belgian newspaper referred to by the hon. Member for Dundee:—

> "The fact that a Bill of this kind was to be introduced into the British Parliament shows that public opinion is much occupied with this Measure, which may have a serious effect on Belgian trade. Owing to the extreme cheapness of these goods"—

see how this article by anticipation contradicts every one of the arguments of hon. Members opposite against this Bill—

> "England has been the principal market for articles manufactured in our prisons, and particularly in our penal settlements. That market once closed to a trade of this particular kind —England no longer condescending to take prison-made goods—they will naturally begin to raise serious and even disloyal competition against the regular trade of Belgium."

[*Cheers.*] I call the attention of the House to these friends of the working classes. [*Cheers.*] Here is their proposal—that goods made in Belgian prisons, and which Belgians will not sell in Belgium because it would be disloyal competition with Belgian working men, should come unrestricted into this country to engage in loyal competition with British working men. [*Cheers.*] The Opposition may be divided on questions of foreign policy, of South African policy, and colonial policy. On this question it is indeed united! [*Cheers.*] Here is a policy to go to the country with—"Convict labour; convict goods for the British consumer!" [*Laughter and cheers.*] The hon. Member for Spen Valley said the Bill was a violation of the principles this country had adopted during the last 50 years—"an insidious attack on free trade." He put it forward as a principle of free trade that cheapness to the consumer was the one thing to be regarded. We had nothing to do with where the goods came from, or how they were made.

*Mr. WHITTAKER said this was not quite his point. It was said that prison-made goods, because of their cheapness, displaced labour here, and he submitted that, if that argument was sound, it ought to be applied to all classes of goods, whether made in prisons or anywhere else. [*Cheers.*]

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is quite true. But, unless my memory deceives me, the hon. Member went further. He emphasised it by saying that the great object was that the consumer should buy his goods in the cheapest market. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy adopted the same line of argument. Were the hon. Members consistent? Why, under these circumstances, do they support a resolution against sweated goods. The other side has again and again pressed the view that we are not to buy sweated goods—goods made cheap—because the labour employed in making them is badly paid. Very well; do they mean to say in the same breath that you are not to buy goods cheap when made by ill-priced labour, but you may when they are made cheap by prison labour?

*MR. WHITTAKER said his argument was that the conditions of labour in prisons were not as bad as many other conditions of labour. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!"] His contention was, if they opposed the importation of goods because made in prisons, why not oppose the importation of goods made under worse conditions?—and he referred to carpets made in Turkey and Asia and to the cheap labour of India. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid I should be abusing the time of the House if I followed the hon. Member into all his arguments. [*Opposition cries of* "Oh!"] But I am unable to see the consistency of refusing to avail yourself of cheapness, when the result of low wages, and accepting all the conditions of cheapness when the result of foreign convict labour. Yet that is the position to which hon. Members have reduced the theory of free trade. I have said that I hope even now, before the Debate closes, we may hear something from a more prominent Member of the Opposition than the hon. Member for Dundee. If we are favoured to-night with any expression of opinion from either of the two right hon. Gentlemen who spoke in 1895—the Member for Aberdeen and the Member for Montrose—then I am sure they will repeat the language which they then used, and which will convey a most valuable lesson to their followers in regard to the true principles of free trade. [*Cheers.*] Here is what was said by the Member for South Aberdeen:—"He did not consider that the question of free trade arose in the matter at all." [*Ministerial laughter.*] Has he changed his mind since 1895 with regard to that point? He cannot say. [*Renewed laughter.*] I make all allowance for the position in which the right hon. Gentleman finds himself. ["Hear, hear!"] I now come to my right hon. Friend the Member for Montrose (Mr. J. Morley). He said:—

> "If there is an ardent free-trader in the House it is the humble individual who is addressing you. But can I for one moment think I am bound, in the interest of free trade, or in order to be a consistent free-trader, to admit into the markets of this country convict-made goods made in this country, or convict-made goods made elsewhere?"

[*Ministerial laughter and cheers.*] Has my right hon. Friend changed his mind? [Mr. J. MORLEY was understood to intimate that he had not.] No; my right hon. Friend is not so coy as his right hon. colleague. [*Laughter.*] I no longer implore the right hon. Member for Aberdeen to speak. I do not think in the circumstances he could add much to the Debate. ["Hear, hear!"] I am sure I do not mean any disrespect to him, but I mean that, until he has made up his mind about the principles of free trade, I do not see that he can assist us. But my right hon. Friend the Member for Montrose, if he would repeat the lesson he gave in 1895 to his followers below the gangway—if he would teach the hon. Member for the Spen Valley and the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy District the true principles of free trade—really might do the whole House very considerable service. [*Cheers.*] I say that under these circumstances it is perfectly absurd for hon. Gentlemen opposite at this time of day to pretend that the principles of free trade are in question. It has nothing to do with the principles of free trade; it has only to do with the principles of common sense and common justice. [*Cheers.*] I want to point out to the House that every speech to which we have listened, with the possible exception of the speech of the hon. Member for Dundee, has been a speech directly against the principle of this Bill. It is true the hon. Member for Dundee said everything he could think of against the Bill, professed his disbelief in it, and minimised the evil, and undoubtedly, if his arguments were accurate, there ought to be no Bill. But still he did not venture to say, as the other hon. Members opposite did, that he opposed the principle of the Bill. That had hitherto been the main argument, and it is the argument to which I should tie hon. Gentlemen of the Opposition. It is true they added another argument, which is almost one of those works of supererogation. They said the Bill would be ineffective. Of course it is open to them, and if they think they can make it more stringent—if they can make a Bill which is wrong in principle, mind you, which is dealing with a matter which ought not to be dealt with, and does not deserve to be dealt with, more effectively, we shall welcome their assistance. [*Cheers.*] But in the meantime we, who gave this promise and believed there was a real injustice which ought to be remedied, are satisfied with this Bill, and we believe it will be a remedy. [*Cheers.*] We have produced our prescription, after all, with very slight delay. [*Ministerial cheers.*] The Opposition consider there is no disease. You cannot argue the thing from both points of view. Their point is there is no disease. We have produced our prescription and we believe it will be a remedy. As to the persons who think there is no disease, I should say, on the whole, it would be unwise to ask them for a prescription, because under these circumstances it is probable that their pills would be flour and their draughts would be plain water. [*Laughter.*] But we, who believe there is a grievance, have honestly endeavoured to find a remedy; we believe we have found a remedy, and if in the course of examination in Committee any defect can be shown, we shall be perfectly ready to improve our Bill and to improve our remedy. [*Cheers.*]

*MR. JAMES BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) would very frankly satisfy the curiosity of the right hon. Gentleman as to why he did not speak earlier in the Debate. He was very curious to listen to the right hon. Gentleman, and was very anxious to hear how he would reconcile his speech of two years ago with the Bill of to-day. He was very curious to know how he would reconcile the extreme and extravagant language which he used in speaking on this question of foreign prison-made goods in February, 1895, with the minimising and deprecatory language which had been used that night by the President of the Board of Trade. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"] He was very anxious to hear the right hon. Gentleman's statement of the prescription, and to hear him explain and defend a Bill which, on the face of it, seemed an absurd and preposterous remedy. He had been disappointed. [*Ministerial cheers.*] He had been entertained and amused, and he had listened to an admirable exhibition of political agility. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"] But he had had no light cast upon the question with which the House was asked to deal. It was all very well to make a jest and sport of the matter as the right hon. Gentleman had tried to do. [*Opposition cheers.*] They had been amusing themselves for the last five hours. They had not been dealing with a serious matter in a serious way at all, but had been merely amusing themselves by putting up a sham Bill on whose behalf not a single word of argument had been offered on the Government Bench. The right hon. Gentleman opposite endeavoured to escape from the language which he used in February, 1895. He would compare the right hon. Gentleman's language then with that which he had used on the present occasion. He had just told them that there was a very small number of people who were affected by it; but what did he say in 1895? He said:—

> "There is no question upon which the working classes of this country have more generally made up their minds than upon this."

[*Ministerial cheers, and* MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: "I say it now!"] The right hon. Gentleman said it, but it was a different thing to prove it, and he had not attempted to prove it. At the General Election this question was treated with complete contempt. [*Ministerial cries of* "No!"]

*SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Fifty per cent. of the Unionist Members put it in their programmes. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. BRYCE said that, anyhow, the question had failed utterly to excite the interest of the people of this country. [*Ministerial cries of* "Prove it!"] He could prove it from his own experience, and he had consulted a great many of his friends, who all said that the question made no difference to them at the election. [*Ministerial cries of* "Where are they?" *and Opposition cries of* "Order!"] If hon. Members would refer to the Report of the Departmental Committee they would find that that Committee endeavoured to obtain trade opinion upon this subject. They appealed to the trade union councils, and advertised in a great many newspapers, but they had scarcely any response to their appeals, and they were satisfied that the working classes of this country did not take any interest in the question. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!"] The right hon. Gentleman opposite said, on the occasion to which he had referred:—

> "We are face to face with what is practically a national and almost unanimous demand."

Where was the evidence of such a demand, and if there was such a demand, why had the Government waited for two years before responding to it? The right hon. Gentleman said that this was a question of great practical importance. They knew what that meant. Practical importance meant in his eyes electioneering importance, and nothing else—["hear, hear!"]—and even in regard to the electioneering importance of the question the right hon. Gentleman was utterly mistaken. [*Laughter.*] He adhered himself to every word which he used in the Debate in February, 1895. He said then that this was an infinitesimal grievance not worth notice, much less legislation, and that it was useless to legislate for this grievance, such as it was, unless they could legislate effectively. The Bill before the House would not effect a remedy; it would be futile. Let him recall to hon. Members' minds the Report of the Departmental Committee. It was a perfectly impartial Committee. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!"] Its impartiality was not challenged at the time of its appointment.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I took every opportunity of saying it was packed. [*Cheers and laughter.*]

MR. BRYCE: At that time no one ventured to say that it was not a fair and competent Committee.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I beg pardon. I said so always. [*Laughter.*]

*MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman never said so in this House.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I never had the opportunity. It was a hole-and-corner Committee packed in the right hon. Gentleman's own office. [*Loud laughter.*]

*MR. BRYCE said that the right hon. Gentleman generally found an opportunity of saying a thing which he wanted to say. [*Laughter.*] He repeated that, although the subject was frequently mentioned in the House, the impartiality of the Committee was not challenged. The hon. Member for Sheffield was himself upon it. [Sir HOWARD VINCENT: "Yes, but I left it!"] [*Laughter.*] The Report of the Committee went to show that the quantity and value of all prison-made goods imported into this country were extremely small, that it was too small to have any substantial influence on the trade. ["Hear, hear!"] It was an interesting fact that the number of persons employed in the brush and mat making trades had increased during the few years in which the competition of prison-made goods was stated to be injuring the trade; and another interesting fact was that it appeared that in those countries which sent brushes and mats to this country goods were produced by free labour quite as cheaply as by prison labour, so that, as far as the interests of the British workman were concerned, nothing whatever would be gained by prohibiting the importation of prison-made goods. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman made an extraordinary error in his statement about the Germans, when he said they ear-marked these goods for British consumption. That was not the case. ["Hear, hear!"] What the Germans did was not to sell them in the immediate vicinity of the prison—[*Ministerial cheers*]—that was to say, within eight miles of the prison—but they sold them in other parts of Germany. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to twist some words of his in the former Debate into a meaning they did not bear. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to represent that he said that the German Government were increasing the production in a variety of industries in order to compete with British goods. What he did say was:—

> "The policy of the German Government had been to spread prison labour over as many trades as possible"—

["Hear, hear!" *from* Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]—

> "in order that it might have no injurious effect on any particular trade."

[*Cheers and Ministerial laughter.*] That was to say, in order that it might not be said that in Germany they were competing with any particular trade, they spread their prison production over a variety of trades—["hear, hear!"]—and it was shown before the Committee that no practical harm could come to British trade from that, or, of course, to German trade. There was not a tittle of evidence to show that any harm was done, and the right hon. Gentleman had never tried to produce any.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I? I did not offer myself as a witness before your Departmental Committee. [*Ministerial cheers and laughter.*]

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman did what was much more important. He offered himself as a witness before the House—[*cheers*]—and he made statements before the House which were utterly baseless, which he had never even attempted to substantiate, and which he now defied him to substantiate. [*Cheers.*] Another interesting point was brought out by the Committee—namely, that British machine-made goods, even in the lower kind of brushes, could be produced just as cheaply as foreign-made, and the reason why foreign-made goods were allowed to come in, particularly prison-made goods, was because the British manufacturers found it better worth their while to bestow their attention on the production of the superior. This Committee gave every possible opportunity to the brush and matmakers to state their case, and these were the conclusions they came to, and no one had ever disputed them. [*Cheers.*]

*SIR HOWARD VINCENT: That was a majority Report. There was a minority Report.

MR. BRYCE said that was the Report of the Committee. The hon. Member left the Committee because he did not like the way the evidence was going. [*Cheers.*] However, the Committee went further. They inquired not only whether there was a substantial grievance, but also whether, if there was a grievance, it could be remedied. The Committee called some of the officers of the Customs before them and cross-examined them at some length, and they came to the conclusion that the suggestions put forward were unworkable, that they could not be made effective, and that in whatever form they were tried they failed. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not want to detain the House on minor points; they would be found set forth in the evidence and summarised in the Report of the Committee. He was accurate in stating that the suggestions put forward by the Customs were held to be impracticable. He read the words of the Report on this point which declared that the suggestions would do more harm than good, and went on to urge that they were entitled to have some substantial case made out. When they pressed for some kind of figures the Colonial Secretary was obliged to fall back on some anonymous article in a Belgian paper. [*Opposition laughter.*] He could only say they must have some other evidence than that of an anonymous writer, who might be the Member for Sheffield himself. [*Loud laughter.*] It was little short of an insult to the House of Commons—["hear, hear!"]—to ask them to pass legislation on the authority of some writer in a Belgian paper. [*Cheers.*] They asked the promoters to tender evidence,but they could not get it. How were they to get evidence that a brush was made in a prison or not? A brush did not tell its own tale as to where it was made. It was not stamped that it was made in a German prison. The idea was absurd. The Colonial Secretary seemed to have an idea that some persons would be watching round the doors of German prisons, and that they would follow the brushes from one wholesale warehouse to another until at last it came here. [*Laughter*] They knew that in the case of the Merchandise Marks Acts traders would not come forward to help the Board of Trade to enforce those Acts. The Board of Trade must do it themselves; yet the Merchandise Marks Act was much easier of application than this Bill would prove to be. There was not the slightest reason to believe that the evidence would be attainable. They had some experience of other countries. In America, and, he dared say, in Canada, there were a good many laws which looked well on paper, but not in fact. The authorities had received power to make regulations, but none were made, and it was impossible to make out what the authorities were doing. It was easy when there was some trivial demand, or when some one was playing an electioneering card, to bring forward a Bill like this; but the business of responsible and worthy statesmanship was not to bring in Bills unless they could make them work. [*Cheers.*] The "prescription" of the right hon. Gentleman had been referred to. He remembered the speech of the right hon. Gentleman well; it was a curious speech, and it was remarked at the time as being noteworthy for an unaccountable bitterness of tone and language. It culminated in the expression, "We are not going to lend them our prescriptions while he takes the fees." It was observed at the time that it was not, at any rate, a very patriotic course if he had the prescription and was not going to give the country the benefit of it. But now we know that he had no prescription at all. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman went a little further. He did a thing on that occasion which he never remembered a responsible Minister doing before. He turned upon and accused the officials of the Department over which he once had presided. [*Cheers.*] A less becoming act on the part of a responsible Minister had never been done before. [*Cheers.*] Now the House knew what the "prescription" was. It was a bread pill. [*Laughter.*] Any one could prescribe a bread pill; the late Government could have prescribed it then; in fact, there was a Bill of the hon. Member for Sheffield before the House which was like this Bill, only a little better. [*Laughter.*] That Bill might, at any rate, have been tried; this Bill was not worth trying; and he thought that the bread pill of the right hon. Gentleman would be received in every quarter with that unconcern and indifference it deserved. [*Cheers.*] The Bill was a sham and an imposture from beginning to end. [*Cheers and* "Divide!"] He went further and said that the Bill and the whole of the agitation on this subject had been a piece of demagogy—[*cheers*]—which was not creditable to those who had practised it. [*Cheers.*] He did not think that the Bill could do any harm—[*ironical laughter*]—but he thought it was not creditable to the House to pass Bills which would do no good, and which would be an unworkable remedy for an insignificant grievance. [*Cheers.*]

MR. SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich), as the representative of a constituency which did not look on this Bill as a trifling Measure, protested against the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He also protested against the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman that when this question was brought before the electors at the last election it was treated with contempt. The contrary was the fact. It was also said that because it was a small matter the House ought not to take up the question. Hon. Gentlemen might as well say that because a man had his pocket picked of 6d., the thief ought not to be punished, because he had not taken more money. In his constituency they considered that this prison labour had robbed the working people of their labour and wages, and he hoped that the House would pass the Bill by a large majority. He mentioned the case of a manufacturer who found that the competition of prisons and reformatory colonies in Belgium was so strong that he had been compelled to go to Belgium and attempt to contract for the labour himself in order that he might be able to compete. The evidence of another brush manufacturer was that he could not possibly compete with prison-made goods, and he knew of three firms, employing 120 hands, who had had to give up their businesses owing to the competition of such goods. We did not allow our own prisoners to compete, except to a very trifling extent, with free labour. Surely, therefore, we ought not to allow the authorities of foreign prisons to send their goods here, goods which were not sold in their own countries. It might be that this Bill would not prove a remedy for the grievance, but, at any rate, it would express the opinion of the House of Commons that some remedy for the evil should be devised, and experience would enable them to amend it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeenshire had said he was filled with disappointment by the statement of the Colonial Secretary. In 1895 the right hon. Gentleman said he did not believe it was possible to introduce a Bill—[Mr. BRYCE: "An effectual Bill!"]—and therefore, no doubt, he was filled with disappointment because this Government had introduced a Bill, one which would be very acceptable to the country. It might be true that only a very small number of people were affected by the Measure, but the country would realise that though the numbers concerned were small, the Government were desirous of seeing justice done to the working classes. In face of the fact that hon. Gentlemen opposite had supported a Motion which declared that it was necessary to take at once some step to remedy this evil, he could not understand why they now thought the remedy could be put off. By going into the "No" lobby upon this occasion they would express their opinion that it was impossible to remedy the evil by legislation, and that therefore they would not make any attempt at a remedy. The supporters of the Bill would vote for it with the conscientious feeling that they were trying to find a remedy for the evil, that they were trying to prevent honest labour being interfered with by the work of prisoners in foreign prisons.

MR. W. ALLAN (Gateshead) saw in the Bill a portion of that policy which they heard of a few nights ago for the taxation of corn. It was said it was meant for the benefit of the working classes, but it did not go far enough to do that. It was honestly meant for that purpose; why did not they go further? What did they do for the working classes who were out of employment by window-sashes and frames being brought into this country, or by flooring, planed, beaded and grooved, being brought in; or what did they do for the glass trade? Had they ever shown any desire whatever to look after these trades? [*Ministerial cries of* "Yes!"] None whatever; and, forsooth! the House was asked to deal with brushes and mats. Had they come to this, that they had to spend hour after hour in discussing shaving brushes and door mats? The whole amount involved per annum was an absolute trifle, and, above all that, they were the cheapest rubbish that came into the country, and that was the reason so few of them were sold. The Bill was simply an absurdity. It was of no use at all, and would not benefit the working classes one iota. The House of Commons was wasting its precious time by such legislation. They wanted something more in keeping with the traditional greatness of the House than trifles of that kind. Did hon. Gentlemen opposite want Protection? [*Some Ministerial cries of* "Yes!"] Now they knew where they were, and he would tell those hon. Gentlemen that he would fight them to the death on that question. Speaking as a working man, and as one who knew the working men as well, perhaps, as anyone in that House, he said honestly and fearlessly that this Bill was a sham.

MR. J. LOWLES (Shoreditch, Haggerston) maintained that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had shown his characteristic prescience when he said that no industry was safe while the present state of things existed. He had canvassed every house and workshop in his constituency, and there were in it numbers of brush factories and mat factories, and boot factories too, which today were suffering from the unfair competition of penal labour in foreign countries. In the London County Council he had had something to do, in conjunction with the hon. Member for Battersea, in drafting a clause, which appeared in all their tenders, to provide that fair wages should be paid to all the employés of those who competed for contracts, but such a clause was largely neutralised while they allowed contractors to supply asylums and other public institutions with goods imported from abroad, some of them the very goods of which they now complained. As a close student of the matter he asserted that, while this might be a small question in the main, yet in a constituency like his own it was a very large question.

Sir J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) appealed to the Government not to continue the system of legislation by reference, but to make their Bills self-intelligible.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 221: Noes, 90.—(Division List, No. 208—appended.)

The announcement of the numbers was received with cheers and counter cheers.

AYES

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allen, Wm. (Newc. under Lyme)
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Arnold, Alfred
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, A. H. Smith- (Hunts.)
Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bass, Hamar
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Begg, Ferdinand Faithfull
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, M. M.
Bigham, John Charles
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, A. Montagu
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh
Chaloner, Captain R. G. W.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clarke, Sir Edw. (Plymouth)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Robert
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Rt. Hn. G. N. (Lanc. S. W
Curzon, Viscount (Bucks)
Dalbiac, Major Philip Hugh
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dane, Richard M.
Davies, Horatio D. (Chatham)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, William Theodore
Duncombe, Hon. Hubert V.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Gen. Sir James Bevan
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Fielden, Thomas
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir R. U. Penrose
Flannery, Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Folkestone, Viscount
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Godson, Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. G'rg's)
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Captain
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down)
Hoare, Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howell, William Tudor
Hutchinson, Capt. G. W. Grice-
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, John H. (Sussex)
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Knowles, Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Edwin (Cornwall)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir Thos. (Londonderry)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan H. (Somerset)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R. (Essex)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverpool)
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lorne, Marquess of
Lowles, John
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkham
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, John William
McCalmont, H. L. B. (Cambs.)
McCalmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
McKillop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Edw. Wm. J.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
More, Robert Jasper
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, Walter
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Northcote, Hon. Sir H. Stafford
Pease, Arthur (Darlington)
Penn, John
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Capt. Ernest George
Priestley, Sir W. Overend (Edin.)
Pryce-Jones, Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, William Cuthbert
Rankin, James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Thomas
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matt. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. McTaggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webster, R. G. (St. Pancras)
Webster, Sir R. E. (Isle of Wight)
Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H. (Aston-under-L.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Rt. Hon. A. H. Dyke
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carmichael, Sir T. D. Gibson-
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.)
Commins, Andrew
Crombie, John William
Daly, James
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, W. Rees- (Pembrokesh.)
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Ellis, Thos. Edw. (Merionethsh.)
Evershed, Sydney
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Matthew (Durham)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Holden, Angus
Horniman, Fredk. J.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lyell, Sir Leonard
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
McArthur, William
McGhee, Richard
M'Hugh, E. (Armagh, S.)
McLeod, John
Maden, John Henry
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)
Mundella, Rt. Hn. Anthony John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Oldroyd, Mark
Owen, Thomas
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, Robert John
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spicer, Albert
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Ure, Alexander
Wedderburn, Sir William
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Govan)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Whittaker.

Main Question put, and agreed to.—Bill read a Second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)—Debate arising,

And, it being after midnight, and Objection being taken to further proceeding, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. GEORGE LAMBERT (Devon, S. Molton) asked whether the Education Bill would be taken on Monday.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I had hoped to take it to-night; but I am afraid there is not much chance of taking it on Monday, as we have promised to put down the Employers' Liability as first Order.

MR. MAURICE HEALY asked what Irish Votes would be taken on Friday.

MR. HANBURY: The Land Commission first and the Local Government Board second, and then the others in the ordinary order.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, considered; to be Read the Third time upon Monday next.

DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PATENT OFFICE EXTENSION (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

FINANCE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Committee deferred till Monday next.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Monday next.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

RATING OF MACHINERY SUSPENSORY BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

IDIOTS INSTITUTIONS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

PRISONERS' PERSONAL CORRECTION PROHIBITION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

ELECTION PETITIONS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SHOP ASSISTANTS (HALF-HOLIDAY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

ESTATES TAIL BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a Second time, and committed for Wednesday next.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned till Monday next.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February) further adjourned till Tuesday next.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

Read the Third time, and passed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday 31st May.

CORN SALES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Read a Second time, and committed for this day.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Thursday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

House Adjourned at a Quarter after Twelve o'Clock.

The asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 14th May 1897.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Lilford—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

Lord NORTON gave notice that on Monday next he would ask the Lord President of the Council whether he hopes to be able to introduce a Bill on Secondary Education this Session, or, if not, early next year.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

Read a Second time.

The Marquess of LONDONDERRY moved:—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to whom the Bill shall be referred (1) to omit Part IV. and Schedules; (2) to inquire into the advisability of extending the municipal franchise to all Parliamentary voters, and of providing that the burgess lists shall be revised and made up by the same persons and at the same time as the Parliamentary register, before the increased powers proposed to be given by the Bill are conferred upon the Corporation, and to make provisions in the Bill for same; and that they have power to make provisions for an amendment of the law as to the election and tenure of office of aldermen councillors, and as to the appointment and tenure of office of any officers annually elected by the Corporation, or appointed by any persons nominated by the Corporation."

He said that on no less than three occasions had a Bill of a similar character been presented to Parliament, and the Bill might appear at first sight innocuous and harmless. The first three provisions were as follows: (1) to borrow money for fire brigade purposes; (2) to enable the Corporation to compel the owner or occupier of vacant land likely to be a nuisance to fence it in; and (3) to make further provision with regard to the supply of water. Those three provisions had the hearty support of the section of the community whom he represented. But the Bill went a great deal further than that, because it interfered with the municipal franchise as it at present existed. Now, he submitted that the question of the franchise could only be dealt with by Parliament, and not by private individuals bringing in a Bill to promote the interests of a certain section of the community, and interfering with the right of franchise at present enjoyed by other sections. In support of that doctrine he quoted declarations made by the Lord Chancellor and the Earl of Morley, as well as the Speaker of the House of Commons. At present the rating qualification in Dublin was represented by the very smallest coin of the realm. It was divided into two sections, the ratepayers who paid £8 and over, and those who paid less. The ratepayers of £8 and over were automatically placed in the list or roll of burgesses, subject to their having paid their rates and fulfilled the residence qualification. In the case of those who paid less than £8, they had to prove the same conditions, but what he particularly drew attention to was that these rates were invariably paid by the landlord. Of course it might be said that these rates were taken into consideration in the rent, but the answer to that was that the rent taken would in no way be altered whether the rates were paid by the landlord or by the tenant. Consequently the tenant got considerably the better part of the bargain. But what was the result? The result was that those ratepayers who paid no rates whatever formed the great majority of Dublin burgesses. What would be the situation if his Instruction were not accepted? In the first place, the Town Clerk would be forced to place on the roll every occupier, no matter what might be his period of residence. The real ratepayer who paid rates as tenant would be placed on a far worse footing, and at a great disadvantage as compared with the occupying tenant who paid no rates whatever. The Town Clerk would be forced to place upon the roll men who, he knew well, should be disqualified from having a vote at all, for the simple reason that they had not been in occupation sufficiently long to qualify them for a vote.

The onus of disproving the right rested upon those who objected, and what would be the result? He was told on good authority that in July of next year 50 per cent. of the new voters would have changed their residence and lost their qualification, with the result that 15,000 additional voters, mostly bogus, would be added to the list of those who enjoyed the municipal franchise. Of course, it might be said that these voters could be objected to, but under the municipal franchise this involved personal service of the objection, and to prove that 15,000 objections had been served on 15,000 people by hand was not only a very tiresome but a very costly business. There was another point. Under this Bill, the Town Clerk received remuneration for preparing the list of those whom he proposed to add to the municipal franchise, and while he had every confidence in the present Town Clerk, he was not so confident that the Town Clerks who might be appointed in years to come would discharge their duties with the same impartiality. The Unionist Party in Dublin maintained that if the municipal franchise were to be altered and ameliorated it should be done by Parliament, and not by a Bill which was ostensibly to deal with the water supply of Dublin, but in reality meant to eliminate the Unionist majority in Dublin from the representation they at present enjoyed. At the present moment they could boast only of 11 members out of 60. But if these 15,000 further voters were enfranchised, the Unionists would be absolutely eliminated. Perhaps it would be said to him, connected as he was with the North of Ireland, that this was the procedure which had been followed in Belfast and other cities where the Protestant element was paramount. He contradicted that argument. A franchise Bill had been recently passed which had given to the very small Nationalist minority in Belfast considerable representation on the Corporation. The same thing had taken place in Armagh and Derry; and, therefore, if the Nationalist Party, which was in a minority in these cities, were allowed that representation which he maintained a minority should always be allowed to have, the Unionist minority in Dublin had an equal claim to representation. It might be said, Why did not the Unionist Party in the House of Commons reject the Measure? The Unionists in Dublin had fully believed that the majority which they had helped to return to Parliament would see that their rights were not taken away; and that this Water Bill, with political clauses tacked on at the fag end, would have been denounced by the Chief Secretary. On the 30th March a whip was issued by the Unionist Whips in the House of Commons, stating that the Dublin Corporation Bill would be taken at the time of Private Business, and that an Amendment would be moved by Mr. Carson. The Dublin Unionists imagined from that that the Government were going to protect their rights. He did not wish to say a word derogatory of the Chief Secretary, but his right hon. Friend could not have understood the importance of the question when he said that he did not regard it as a Party question, and that everyone was to vote as he liked. In consequence of that declaration, and the fact that the Dublin Unionists did not issue a whip—which they would have done, had they known what line the Chief Secretary was going to take—the franchise clauses were carried by a very small majority. The feelings of the Dublin Unionists were very strong. A meeting was held by them on Monday last, presided over by the President of the Chamber of Commerce, and attended by one of the Governors of the Bank of Ireland, and by the most influential Unionists of the city; and that meeting had requested him to move these Instructions in the House of Lords, declaring that as they helped to return a majority of 150 in favour of Unionist principles they could not understand why that majority should consent to the elimination of Unionists in Dublin. He knew that certain noble Lords and intimate friends of his in the House of Commons would like to see the franchise extended to women, and objected to the line taken by Mr. Carson, because it excluded women. He would tell their Lordships in strict confidence that he was a very anti-woman voter—[*laughter*]—but he was not so narrow-minded as not to recognise the strength of the convictions of his friends who thought differently from him on that point. But why did they not get a Bill brought in to deal with the question, instead of supporting a Measure which was ostensibly a Water Bill? It was the duty of Parliament to deal with the question frankly, and not to allow it to be settled in a Private Bill. He maintained that the action of his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees was not, according to his own showing, advisable, and, according to the ruling of the Speaker of the House of Lords, that it was very near the line where it would be out of order. He should be perfectly willing to support the Bill without the franchise clauses; but so unjust did he think the treatment of the loyal minority in Dublin, that unless those clauses were withdrawn, he should ask their Lordships to support his Instruction.

THE EARL OF MORLEY (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said that his action in introducing this Bill was merely a part of his official duties as Chairman of Committees. He was in no way responsible for all the Private Bills which he from time to time introduced. His practice was, if a Bill were opposed on Second Reading, not to move the Second Reading; but as he presumed that this Bill was not opposed in principle, but that only part of it was opposed, he thought it his duty to introduce the Measure to their Lordships' notice. He was in no way responsible for what it had contained. He need not enter into the long question of the franchise, but he would state the history of the Bill, and the position of the question generally. As to the Instruction of his noble Friend, it had not of recent years been the practice in their Lordships' House to move mandatory Instructions to the Committees to which Private Bills were referred; and though his noble Friend was within his rights, he rather deprecated such a practice gaining ground. The second part of the Instruction seemed to go far beyond the scope of the Bill itself, and direct the Committee to introduce into the Bill matters which would not be covered by the notices issued with the Bill in November last; and on that ground, the Measure, if amended, as his noble Friend desired, would not be in accordance with the Standing Orders. As to the Bill itself, his noble Friend said quite justly that it was a Water Bill, and he adhered most strongly to the opinion which he expressed last year, that these franchise clauses should not be introduced into Private Bills. But at the same time, it was necessary to consider the circumstances and reasons which had led to their being introduced in this case. Last year the Bill was introduced in the House of Lords purely as a Water Bill. During its passage through the House of Commons the franchise clauses were introduced under a mandatory Resolution passed by the whole House. When the Bill came back to the House of Lords, their Lordships had no opportunity of discussing the new question raised, and there was no time for any opponent to the clauses to be heard. As the new clauses were not covered by the notices issued with the Bill in the previous November, they were so obviously out of order, that the Standing Orders Committee refused to dispense with the Standing Orders in respect of that portion of the Bill, and the Bill was returned to the House of Commons with those clauses struck out. The consequence was that the Bill was lost, and the Dublin Corporation spent its money in vain. This year the Water Bill was reintroduced, but with a view of avoiding the catastrophe of last year, the Corporation put the franchise clauses into the original draft, and they were covered by the notices issued with the Bill in the previous November. The Bill was introduced first in the House of Commons, where an Instruction was carried by the whole House empowering the Committee to introduce another franchise clause giving the vote to women. The Bill came back to the House on Report with this additional clause inserted, and then a Motion was made for the omission of the franchise clauses altogether. That Motion was rejected; and, therefore, the Bill came to their Lordships' House with the old franchise clauses and the new one expressly approved by the House of Commons. Though he entirely adhered to the opinion he had expressed on more than one occasion that it was undesirable to insert measures of this kind having a party and political character attached to them into private Bills, he asked the House to consider whether it was desirable, after what had passed in the House of Commons, to send back the Bill with the clauses omitted from it, with the almost certain result that the Bill would be again wrecked, that the money spent in promoting it would be lost, and the long-standing quarrel about water between Dublin and the surrounding districts would be left unsettled. Their Lordships might say that the franchise was of more importance than water. ["Hear, hear!"] He would not argue that question, but he would point out to the House that if the principle was for the first time embodied in the Bill, he would agree that the clauses should be expunged. But a Bill attempting to prove the present admittedly unsatisfactory condition of the Irish municipal franchise having unfortunately failed to pass into law, owing to the change of Government a few years ago, the result was that individual Irish boroughs had taken advantage of gas or water Bills to introduce modifications into their system of municipal franchise. That was done in the case of Belfast, Londonderry, Armagh, Drogheda, Waterford, and in the districts around Dublin, Blackrock, Rathmines, and Kingstown. Therefore, having those precedents in view, it was doubtful whether it could now be argued fairly that the municipal franchise must not be altered in private Bills. He did not wish to argue with his noble Friend as to the effect of the clauses. They were rather difficult to grasp, but, as he understood them, they did not alter the actual qualifications of the municipal electors, but created a new mode for their getting on the burgess roll. No doubt that alteration in procedure would have a large effect, but the franchise was not altered, and, having regard to the fact that the Measure had been passed by the House of Commons, that it did not establish a precedent, because, unfortunately, the precedent had been established in many cases before, and having regard also to the fact that, if the Instruction were passed, it would mean the almost certain destruction of the Bill, he thought the House would have some hesitation before accepting the Instruction.

The Earl of MAYO said he did not give way to the noble Marquess in regard to his principles as a Unionist, and he knew very well who were the people who had whipped up the Irish Unionist Peers in this matter. But, after all, considering the relative numbers of Nationalists and Unionists in Dublin, the question of Unionist representation in the Corporation of Dublin was not of great importance. He would point out that the ratepayers of Dublin had already paid £10,000 in the promotion of Bills of a similar character to this, but which had failed to pass, and if the Instruction of the noble Marquess were carried, this Bill would also be wrecked. It was all very well to say the Unionists should have a representation on the Corporation of Dublin, but they must take matters as they found them in Dublin, and so long as matters remained as they were at present, the Nationalists would continue to run the show in Dublin. He thought the Irish Unionist Alliance, of which he was a member, was a little hysterical about this question. In another whip that had been sent out by another Unionist Party in Dublin—the Unionist Burgesses—it was said that the Bill, if passed, would seriously discourage Unionist activity in Dublin, and that it would imperil the safety of the Unionist representation of the Stephen's Green Division in Parliament. With all due respect to those people, he should say that that was rubbish. He hoped the House would follow the advice given by Lord Morley, and allow the Bill to go through. Things were carried on in Ireland in a different way than they were carried on in this country. There were not in Ireland such sticklers for order as they were in England. But the Bill, as it stood, would not do that immense amount of harm to the Unionist cause in Dublin that the noble Marquess seemed to apprehend, and, on the other hand, he, who worked a great deal with the people of Dublin in many matters, was aware that it was a good Measure.

*The Earl of BELMORE said he was not converted by the arguments of his noble Friend, which were curious arguments coming from a Unionist source. This Bill was primarily a water Bill. He had no wish to stand in the way of a good water supply to Dublin, where, although he was not a rated occupier, he spent a good deal of time during the year, and used a good deal of Dublin water. But he considered that the franchise clauses were more important than the water clauses. His reasons for supporting the Instruction of the noble Marquess were that the proposed alteration in municipal franchise procedure would have the effect of creating a large number of faggot votes. He did not agree with the noble Marquess that the 15,000 votes that would be added to the franchise would be all faggot votes, but it was clear that a large proportion of them would be of that character. The result would be that the Unionist representation of Dublin would probably be reduced to nothing, and the largest ratepayers would have no voice in the spending of the rates. He had always held that taxation and representation should go together. That was considered a sound doctrine when he was young, but it was not fashionable now. He, however, still supported it, and for that reason he intended to vote for the Instruction of the noble Marquess.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH said he would not have intervened in the Debate had not the noble Marquess referred to the Government opposition to his Instruction. He therefore merely wished to say that there was no Government opposition to the Instruction, neither was there any Government approval of it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said he was not disposed to withdraw from what he had said on a former occasion as to the inconvenience and irregularity of amending the municipal franchise law by means of private Bills intended to supply communities with gas or water. It was calculated to reduce what was a great public question —the question of how the franchise should be exercised by the community— into a mere local question between parties. He could not deny that Parliament had in the past allowed a certain number of boroughs in Ireland to reform their civic electoral system by means of private Bills, and it might be argued that it would not be fair, after allowing it in one case, to disallow it in another. If the Committee to whom the Bill was referred thought there were inappropriate provisions in it, it would be competent for them to strike them out if they liked, but this was a mandatory Instruction to the Committee, which did not give them discretion in the matter. He had read the Bill with great care, and he thought it needed to be so read, and there were some objections which he should entertain very strongly if he were sitting on the Committee. It would be open to the noble Marquess to move an Amendment to the Bill even after the Committee stage. He confessed it seemed to him to be a somewhat precipitate course to take from the Committee any discretion. He suggested to the noble Marquess that he should divide the Instruction into two parts, and deal with the second part afterwards.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY entirely concurred with the noble and learned Lord as to the objection generally to the practice. He thought it was obviously inconvenient to deal with such a subject as municipal franchise in a Bill of this kind. If the Bill went to a Committee there would be ample opportunity to amend any provisions, and on the Third Reading the House might deal with it as it thought proper. He thought nothing was more objectionable than that municipal matters should be considered with reference to the divisions of political parties in this country. [*Cheers.*] An alteration in the franchise should not be made with reference to any consideration whatever as to whether the alterations would be in favour, or not, of the Unionist, Nationalist, or any other party in Dublin, but simply on the ground of whether the whole population in a municipality was or was not fairly represented. ["Hear, hear!"]

*THE DUKE OF RUTLAND said he quite agreed with what had been said by the last speaker, and by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack on the subject of introducing politcal considerations into gas and waer Bills; but the argument appeared to him to be an extraordinary one, that because the Houses of Parliament had committed an error once or twice—[*cheers*]—that error should be perpetuated for all time. That was an unfortunate position to adopt. He was quite willing to incur the slight inconvenience which might result from voting for the noble Marquess's Instruction and disregarding the other precedents.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY said he entirely concurred with that part of the Bill which dealt with the subject of water, but he entirely disapproved of that part which dealt with municipal or political matters. He had desired to divide his Instruction into two parts, and if he had been defeated on the first part he had intended to divide the House on second part. He entirely dissociated from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, he would ask the House to accept the first part of the Instruction, and if that were carried he would drop the second part. He entirely disassociated himself from the political question, which he thought had been introduced for Party purposes.

The House divided on the Motion, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to whom the Bill shall be referred to omit Part IV. and Schedules."

CONTENTS	66
NOT CONTENTS	48

DIVISION LIST.—CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Rutland, D.

Hertford, M.
Zetland, M.

Belmore, E. [*Teller.*]
Cranbrook, E.
de Montalt, E.
Feversham, E.
Minto, E.
Rosse, E.
Stanhope, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*). [*Teller.*]
Verulam, E.

Bangor, V.
Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Hood, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Templetown, V.

Ely, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.

Ashburton, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Barnard, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Clarina, L.
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Connemara, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Egerton, L.
Erskine, L.
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Harlech, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Hindlip, L.
Hopetoun, L. (*E. Hopetoun.*)
Hothfield, L.
Leconfield, L.
Lilford, L.
Lingen, L.
Llangattock, L.
Loch, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Mendip, L. (*V. Clifden.*)
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mostyn, L.
Mount Stephen, L.
Norton, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Rathmore, L.
Rowton, L.
St. Levan, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Somerton, L. (*E. Normanton.*)
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Suffield, L.
Ventry, L.
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford.*)

NOT CONTENTS.

Halsbury, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Lansdowne, M.

Camperdown, E.
Ducie, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Mayo, E. [*Teller.*]
Morley, E.
Onslow, E.
Romney, E.
Selborne, E.
Spencer, E.
Stamford, E.
Waldegrave, E.

Oxenbridge, V.
Powerscourt, V.

Balfour, L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Coleridge, L.
Digby, L.
Dorchester, L.
Hawkesbury, L.
Heneage, L.
Herries, L.
Herschell, L.
James, L.
Kenry, L. (*Earl Dunraven and Mount-Earl*)
Kinnaird, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Magheramorne, L.
Monkswell, L. [*Teller*]
Northbourne, L.
Playfair, L.
Reay, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stanmore, L.
Stuart of Castle Stuart, L. (*E. Moray.*)
Teynham, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

Resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Does the noble Marquess move the second part of the Instruction?

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: No.

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

Committee (which stands appointed for Monday next) put off to Thursday next.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

Brought from the Commons; Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 84.]

FISHERIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Fisheries Acts was presented by the Earl of Dudley; Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 88.]

CHURCH PATRONAGE TRANSFERS BILL [H.L.].

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said the Bill was brief in itself and simple in its character. It was intended to meet a difficulty of not infrequent occurrence. It was obviously desirable that the Bishop should be able to know who was the patron of any individual benefices in his diocese; and in some senses it was important and necessary, because there were occasions on which notices had to be given to the patron of the living when any steps were taken in regard to it. In a large number of instances this knowledge was not within the reach of the Bishop. All that could be ascertained was who made the presentation to the living when a vacancy last occurred. Since that date the patronage might have changed hands many times, and frequently that had been the case. When the living became vacant the presentation was sent to the Bishop, who was bound to act upon it on ascertaining that the presentation in itself was valid. But all the time this might be an illegal transaction. The patronage might have been sold during the vacancy. It was to meet such a case that he had drawn up this Bill, and he believed it would meet a large number of cases which were continually occurring and giving trouble to the Bishops. The Bill provided that on a living becoming vacant notice in writing of the intended transfer and the address of transferor and transferee should be sent to the Bishop. This would render impossible the sale of next presentations during the time of a vacancy. Besides meeting a practical difficulty the Bill would tend, if not to abolish, at any rate to diminish, the traffic in livings, because when livings were sold they were often repurchased and sold again, and passed from hand to hand that some pecuniary gain might be made. He moved the Second Reading of the Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR thought the House would be well advised to see if the Bill carried out the object which the most rev. Prelate had in view, as he could see one or two difficulties which might arise by adhering to the language of the Bill without providing some safeguards.

LORD HERSCHELL said he heartily sympathised with the object of the Bill. But his fear was lest it should be too little. It dealt with a great evil—of that he had no doubt—but it dealt with it so tenderly that he was afraid it would not do much to diminish the evil.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK said he was quite aware that there was a much larger question lying behind; but attempts had been made to deal with the larger question both in that House and the other without any success. Therefore, it was better to do what one could, even if the Bill did not cover the whole scope of the evil, than let abuses go on year after year without any attempt to deal with them. He would be willing in Committee to make any alteration in the wording of the Measure, but he trusted that by allowing the Second Reading of the Bill their Lordships would show the desire, which he was sure they all felt, to get rid of this abuse, and do what they could, if they could not do all they desired. ["Hear, hear!"]

Read 2^a (according to Order); and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be Read 3^a on Monday next.

REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS

Considered in Committee (according to Order); reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be Read 3^a on Monday next.

ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS (HOLIDAYS) BILL.

LORD BELPER, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said it was to enable the Metropolitan Police Courts to be closed on any day observed as a bank holiday. The immediate object of the Bill was to enable the courts to be closed on June 22, the day for the celebration of the 60th year of the Queen's reign. The courts were closed on thanksgiving days, but there was a technical reason for not proclaiming June 22 as a Thanksgiving Day, because, under the Bills of Exchange Act, bills due on bank holidays became payable the day after, but bills due on thanksgiving days were payable the day before. The Bill had passed the House of Commons, and it was desirable it should become law without delay.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA (HEALTH).

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN rose to call attention to the prevalence of contagious diseases in Her Majesty's Army, especially in India, and to move,—

> "That in view of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the India Office of February 20. 1897, it is, in the opinion of this House, urgently necessary that an Inquiry be made into the effect of such diseases upon the Forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within Her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the measures which are, or have been, in force in this and other countries for the prevention of such diseases."

He said that since he put this Motion down on the Notice Paper some time ago, a very considerable change had taken place in the circumstances. Had he brought the matter forward at that time, he would have been bound to enter into a somewhat lengthy and exhaustive examination of a good many facts and statistics. But since then a Departmental Committee, presided over by his noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for India, had presented a Report which dealt with all the facts of the case as far as they affected India, clearly and graphically, and the Secretary of State had issued a Dispatch to the Indian Government on the subject with which their Lordships were cognisant. It would not, therefore, be necessary for him to go in great detail into ancient facts and statistics. The Report relieved him of that, but it also opened up a very much larger aspect of the whole case, for it referred not only to the reaction of the disease upon Her Majesty's troops in India, but also to the reaction and its effects upon the whole population at home. While he most heartily approved and applauded what the Government had done he could not conscientiously say he believed that any Measures which might be taken by the Indian Government subject to the limitations which were laid down in the Dispatch of the Secretary of State would prove efficacious in dealing with this evil, which was so detrimental to the strength of the Army in India and dangerous to the health of the whole community at home. In 1877 the admissions to hospital from venereal diseases were 362 per 1,000. In 1895 they had risen to 537 per 1,000. That was to say that during those eight years this proportion of men on the sick list owing to these causes had increased at the rate of 48 per cent., and more than half the total number of the forces in India had been affected by the diseases. The effect of this condition of things upon the efficiency of the troops in India was most graphically described in the Departmental Committee's Report. It stated that in 1895, 45 per 1,000, or, altogether, 3,200 men out of a total force of 71,031, were constantly in hospital from this cause. These were terribly high figures; but bad as they were they did not, as the Report showed, by any means represent the actual inefficiency. The Report mentioned cases of these diseases which were being treated outside the hospital, and which did not come into the Returns at all. It called attention to the fact that many men were in hospital or under treatment for various diseases of another character, which were either induced or greatly aggravated by venereal disease. The Report also alluded to the fact that a large number of men who were nominally cured were only fit for service under peace conditions, and would break down on field service. Among 5,822 men detailed for field service with the Chitral Relief Force, 462, or nearly 8 per cent., had to be rejected for venereal disease; 279 more, or an additional 4½ per cent., had to be transferred from the field hospitals to the base for the same cause. The Chitral force was a fair sample of the whole, and calculating on that basis they were face to face with the appalling fact that out of a force of 70,000 men no less than 9,000, or 13 per cent. of the whole, were unfit for native service, owing to a cause which, to a great extent, at any rate, was a preventible cause. ["Hear, hear!"] The Report certainly did not make the worst of the case. In cases of that kind it merely assumed that a soldier sent to the field hospital and from there to the base on active service was a soldier lost. As a matter of fact the detriment was greater than that, for every sick soldier on a campaign was an encumbrance and infinitely worse than no soldier at all. He remembered very well the speech of his noble Friend the Secretary of State for War, in introducing the Army Reserve Bill, in which he lamented the difficulty of sending so small a force of 20,000 men out of the country without dislocating and disarranging all ordinary military routine, and as their Lordships knew he recommended, and the Legislature sanctioned, an increase in the Army at an annual expense of £600,000. Putting aside altogether their duty as a civilised country, putting aside what he thought their duty as a humane nation and acting within the spirit of the religion they professed, putting aside also the protective duty that Parliament owed to the whole community and looking at the matter purely from a commercial point of view as a mere question of pounds, shillings, and pence, it was perfectly plain that if efficacious steps could be taken to check the ravages of this disease there would be a greater gain to the efficiency of the Army than there would be by the increase to the Army that the Legislature had recently sanctioned, and his noble Friend would no longer have to deplore, or, at any rate, not to the same extent, the lamentable fact that they could not send 20,000 men out of the country without disarranging the whole course of their military routine. That was bad enough, but this dead loss to the Army did not represent the whole of the mischief, for the knowledge of the prevalence of these diseases had a most detrimental effect on recruiting, parents dissuading their sons from entering the Army from a natural dread of the consequences to which their children might be exposed by service in India. That was not strange, but was a natural state of things. The Report gave an account of the condition of these unfortunate men in Netley:—

> "Before reaching the age of 25 years these young men have come home, presenting a most shocking appearance; some lay there having obviously but a short time to live; others were unrecognisable from disfigurement by reason of the destruction of their features, or had lost their palates, their eyesight, or their sense of hearing; others again were in a state of extreme emaciation, their joints distorted and diseased. Not a few are time-expired, but cannot be discharged in their present condition, incapacitated as they are to earn their livelihood, and in a condition so repulsive that they could not mix with their fellow-men."

Not only had the diseases increased enormously in quantity, but they had also increased enormously in virulence. In 1887 there were 29 per 1,000 suffering from secondary syphilis. That number had been steadily rising until it now amounted to 85 per 1,000. The Return for 1894 showed that of a total of 70,000 men in India 5,421 had been in hospital for secondary diseases during the term of their Indian service, and probably many more were suffering from the same disease who had not been treated in hospital for it. The officials at Netley declared that never had there been so many cases of secondary syphilis in the hospital nor of so bad a type. Consider the effect that that must have upon the civil population at home. Out of 13,000 men who returned from India every year, 3,640 were impregnated with this terrible and fatal disease, and a very small proportion were married. They became absorbed in the population at home; they married, and in many cases they transmitted the disease to their innocent offspring. Moreover, this disease, amongst many terrors and horrors, was transmissible by many means and with the greatest facility. The Departmental report said:—

> "Doctors contract it in the performance of their duties. It may be caught through drinking out of a cup, or smoking a pipe, which has been touched by diseased lips; nurses can communicate it to infants, and infants to nurses. It is altogether a most easily communicable poison. The present condition of the Army in India, with the enormous prevalence of venereal disease which has been shown to exist, yearly sending home thousands of men infected with constitutional taint, is therefore a great and growing source of danger to the whole community. The influence which it is liable to exercise upon the health of the home population is one of the gravest aspects of the whole question."

These grave words were worthy of the attention not only of Parliament, but of the whole country. The gravity of the disease had always been known. In 1882 a Select Committee of the House of Commons reported:—

> "The testimony to its severity, and to the injuries inflicted by it on the person who contracts it by contact, and on his or her innocent descendants, was irrestible."

He remembered that Sir James Paget stated in his evidence before the Lords Committee:—

> "We now know that certain diseases of the lungs, liver, and spleen are all of syphilitic origin, and the mortality from syphilis in its later forms is, every year, found to be larger and larger by its being found to be the source of a number of diseases, which previously were referred to other origins or to accidents."

Quite recently the Royal College of Surgeons described the disease as one

> "which not only undermines the constitution of those who contract it in the first instance, but, by reason of the many ways in which it may be transmitted, destroys the health and happiness of countless other persons, and induces in the children of those originally infected diseases of a most formidable character."

The Royal College of Physicians said that in its opinion the disease was:—

> "One of the most serious, insidious and lasting of all the contagious diseases that afflict humanity."

That was the situation as far as India was concerned. Out of 70,000 men in the Army there, 3,200 were invalided, and 9,000 were absolutely unfit for active service. A constant stream of men was being poured into the population and absorbed by it, conveying the most persistent and virulent poison known into the blood of the people. As to the Army generally, he maintained that the figures were not creditable to us. In round numbers, the figures per 1,000 were—in Germany 27, France 44, Russia 43, Austria 65, Italy 71, and British troops in United Kingdom 204. Various measures had been enforced both at home and in India to deal with the evil. He admitted that the preventive and sanitary measures adopted in India had been more or less a partial failure because they had disappointed those who expected better results. But the causes of the partial failure were the change to the short service system, which introduced into India a very large number of very young and inexperienced men; the creation of camps of exercise; and the greater movement of troops throughout the country. When the men were in the cantonments they were influenced by the regulations in force; when they were absent from the cantonments they were not; and it would be found that disease increased whenever large numbers of men were absent from the cantonments, and decreased when they were within the sphere of influence of protective and sanitary measures. Strong presumptive evidence on that point was made conclusive by the enormous increase in disease and the increase in its severity since the Indian Government were obliged, owing to a most lamentable Resolution of the Legislature —[*cheers*]—to abolish the regulations. That view was borne out by all the authorities most competent to judge. An experiment was made by the Indian Government in 1884. They closed some hospitals to see what the result would be; and in 1885 it was reported that the experimental closure had resulted in—

> "such an enormous and progressive increase in the prevalence of disease that the military authorities considered it absolutely essential to the efficiency of the troops stationed in the cantonments concerned that the lock hospitals should be speedily re-opened and the preventive rules again enforced."

The Army Sanitary Commission reported not many years ago rather adversely to the regulations; but now they said:—

> "We have now proof that the measures heretofore adopted in India, imperfectly administered as they often were, nevertheless exercised a very sensible influence in checking increase in the number of British soldiers admitted into hospital for venereal disease, and in mitigating the severity of the disease itself."

It had often been said in argument that regulations and rules had proved useless, and that the only thing to be relied upon was moral suasion. It was perfectly certain that both in this country and in India regulations and sanitary measures had proved to be most beneficial. Some years ago a Special Committee of the House of Commons in looking into this matter as it affected England, reported very strongly to the effect that the Acts in force in England had a most beneficial effect. Acting on that Report the House of Commons not long after passed a Resolution and the Acts were repealed affecting England. This evil was of the greatest gravity, and he asked their Lordships to consider how it was proposed to meet and grapple with it. There was an Act in force in India dealing with other contagious diseases like typhoid, cholera, and small-pox, the gist of which was that if a medical officer was convinced on credible testimony that a person was diseased he could be ordered to hospital for examination. If he refused the cantonments magistrate could on the request of the medical officer expel him from the cantonments, but owing to the Resolution of the House of Commons this particular disease was not allowed to come under the operation of the sanitary rules that affected other contagious diseases. This disease was made a privileged disease—[*cheers*]—and allowed to contract itself out of the Act. He was glad to say that the Government had relieved the country of that gross slur on its common sense and humanity. ["Hear, hear!"] At any rate, this disease was placed in the same category as all other contagious diseases. But he did not see how it was possible for a medical officer to obtain credible testimony of disease in this instance. Where could he get any testimony? In other diseases he thought that their presence was more or less evident in the appearance and general health of the sufferer, even in their early stages; but he believed he was correct in saying that in syphilis there was nothing to be seen in the person's outward appearance and general health during the incipient stages of the disease. He did not see how it was possible for the medical officer under the ordinary rules to ascertain the presence of this disease in its early stages, and of all the diseases which afflicted mankind this was the one disease which required specially to be treated in its early stages in order, if possible, to prevent the frightful ulterior consequences that often ensued. It seemed common sense that if any effective precaution was to be taken, examination was necessary, and he did not see how medical officers could be satisfied of the presence of disease if examination was absolutely forbidden. He should be perfectly content if the Indian Government had a free hand in this matter. If the suggestion that was made by the Committee of the Royal College of Physicians was carried out, he should be perfectly content. They made the following suggestion:—

> "That as the civil, military, and medical officers in India are best acquainted with the local conditions now existing, and affecting this prevalence of venereal disease, so they are the best judges of the most efficient means of dealing with it. Your Committee, therefore, suggests that power be given to the Government of India to take such steps for the mitigation of this evil as these officers may advise."

He saw the other day that the Committee of the Council of the British Institute of Public Health, under the chairmanship of Lord Playfair, were preparing to present a congratulatory address to Her Majesty on the great progress made in the matter of public health during the reign. It was true great advances had been made—except in one particular, and was it not a scandalous and iniquitous thing that now, if they wished to congratulate the Sovereign on the progress sanitation had made during her reign, they must either wilfully shut their eyes to the existence of a terrible evil, or they must admit that never during that reign had her forces been so decimated by disease, and never has the country been in such danger from the same cause. [*Cheers.*] That was due to the action of Parliament—["hear, hear!"]—in deference to, he had no doubt, a genuine but a very mistaken opinion. He could not understand why people who recognised the danger of pouring a poison of this kind into the blood of the nation, could not unite in their efforts to cleanse the blood of the Army, to purge the life of the nation, and to remove so great a scandal from us as a civilised State. [*Cheers.*] One thing was absolutely proved, and that was that disease was not a deterrent. The moral argument was totally illogical. If it was wrong to mitigate disease because the fact of disease argued immorality, then it must be wrong to cure the disease—["hear, hear"]—and no human being would make so barbarous a proposition as that. He had seen it suggested that the hospital sheet should be taken into consideration as well as the defaulter's sheet in determining a soldier's character. Nothing could be more unjust. The act was not illegal, and it was suggested to punish not the act, but the purely chance results, for the act in itself was legal. That was not only illogical but monstrously unjust. They had experience on this point. Lord Cardwell passed an Order in 1872 which was in force for seven years—an Order which made a stoppage of pay while men were in hospital from this disease. What was the result? It had no effect whatever as a deterrent, but produced the most disastrous results by inducing men to conceal the fact of disease to the last possible stage. He could not see how any man of common sense could rely on moral force and moral force alone. As practical men, they had to deal with men as they were, and not as they ought to be. If the time came when moral force was sufficiently strong to enable men, at the age when the instincts were strongest and the will power weakest, successfully to resist one of the most dominant of human instincts, then there would be no need for sanitation. But while we did everything possible to bring that time about, it surely behoved us meanwhile to do what could legitimately be done to save these men and the whole nation from the effects of acts which might be immoral and improper. ["Hear, hear!"] There were many matters in connection with this subject on which information was needed: whether the general sanitary law in India could be made more effective; the general and local amount and character of the disease in India; the regulations enforced in other countries and the colonies, especially where they had dealings with native races; all these were questions about which information was difficult to obtain. He did not know where he should go to learn what effect we had had upon the native races with which we had come into contact. That subject had never been much noticed, but it ought to be; because, though we might have a perfect right to colonise and extend our possessions, we could not have any moral right to plant alongside the flag the seeds of an insidious and terrible disease. ["Hear, hear!"] Public opinion needed instruction, though, thank God! it had greatly changed on this matter. The great mass of opinion in the country was beginning to realise the gravity of the evil, and the sinfulness of inaction. The Departmental Committee had performed a most admirable work in bringing together in an accessible form the immense amount of information which was before diffused and difficult to obtain; and he thought that an investigation and report of a similar character, but more extensive, would be the best form of inquiry to hold. Nearly all that was wanted could be obtained from the three Departments most concerned—the War Office, the Colonial Office, and the India Office; but the information must be collated, weeded, examined, and brought into accessible shape, so that those who wished to instruct themselves on this great national matter should have facilities for doing so. ["Hear, hear!"] He was rather puzzled to know what to do in respect to the Amendment which was to be moved. Theoretically, he entirely agreed with it; but he did not see how it was practicable. But perhaps if the House agreed to his Motion and refused to accept the Amendment, they might put themselves in a position which would be capable of misconstruction. In some quarters his Motion had been construed as a dilatory Motion; but nothing was further from his intentions. He asked for an inquiry because he thought information was greatly needed to educate public opinion. He entirely applauded Her Majesty's Government for the steps which they had taken; but he feared that they would not prove effectual, and that their comparative failure would be used as an argument against any regulations. He looked upon this as a matter of great national moment. [*Cheers.*] It was not a question of party. ["Hear, hear!"] He would support any Government which attempted to deal efficaciously with this great evil; and he was certain that the great bulk of common-sense opinion in the country would sustain this or any Government in a resolute attempt to check the ravages of an evil which was so detrimental to Her Majesty's forces and so dangerous to the whole population, and which was a scandal to this country as a great people and a civilised nation. [*Cheers.*]

Earl of Dunraven.

LORD ROBERTS OF KANDAHAR: The subject brought forward by the noble Earl is one which nobody would willingly discuss in public if he could conscientiously avoid doing so, and I have been most reluctant to take part in this

Debate. But, my Lords, I recognise so strongly the necessity for measures being adopted to arrest the progress of a great and growing evil—an evil which is sapping the strength of our Army and paralysing many of our best troops—that I feel I should be wanting in my duty to my country and the service to which I have the honour to belong were I to shrink from speaking plainly or neglect to do whatever lies in my power to make my countrymen understand the culpability of permitting to continue unchecked a horrible disease, so far-reaching in its results that it threatens seriously to injure the health and physique of a large proportion of the population of the United Kingdom. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not propose to take up your Lordships' time by giving detailed statistics of the disastrous effects of this disease upon the British troops in India; the proceedings of the Committee presided over by the Under Secretary of State for India show how appalling these effects are. I wish merely to draw your attention, my Lords, to two facts which completely, I think, prove the fallacy of the assertion that contagious disease in India has not increased since the abolition of the Contagious Diseases Act, and clearly demonstrate the necessity for action being taken without delay to preserve the health and efficiency of British soldiers serving in our Eastern Empire. One of the facts, my Lords, which I would bring to your notice is the extraordinary number of men now being invalided from India suffering from the effects of this loathsome disease as compared with the numbers invalided from the same cause when the Contagious Diseases Act was in force. In the statement which I hold in my hand the comparison is made out for 1879 and 1880—the two years immediately preceding the relaxation of the regulations framed under the Contagious Diseases Act—and for 1894 and 1895—the two latest years for which returns are available. In 1879 and 1880 the number of British soldiers in India (exclusive of those on service in Afghanistan) were respectively 49,537 and 50,136. During those two years only 126, or less than ·13 per cent., were invalided to England on account of this special disease. In 1894 and 1895 the number of British soldiers in India were respectively 70,983 and 68,331, of whom a total of no less than 648, or nearly ·5 per cent., were sent home from this same cause. In other words, the proportion of men invalided during the latter period on account of this disease was more than four times as great as it was when the Contagious Diseases Act was in force. ["Hear, hear!"] The other fact, my Lords, to which I would draw your attention, is the number of British soldiers who were found unfit to do their duty during the short time the Chitral expeditionary force was employed in 1895. That force consisted in round numbers of 6,000 British and 11,000 native soldiers. The troops selected were all medically examined before the expedition started, and about 8 per cent. of the British troops were weeded out as unfit for service on account of this most horrible form of contagious disease. The force crossed the frontier on April 3, and by July 31, less than four months, 957 British and only 294 native soldiers had been sent back sick to India. And Lieutenant-General Sir Robert Low, commanding the force, reported that this enormous excess of British soldiers was entirely due to contagious disease, not disease contracted locally, for the condition of affairs rendered that an impossibility, but the old disease breaking out afresh in consequence of the hardships and privations of a four months' campaign. In all other respects the British were as healthy as the native soldiers; so, taking the number of natives sent back as normal, the proportion of British should have been 160 instead of 957. Or, to put it in plainer language, 797 men, more than 13 per cent. of the British troops engaged, were rendered unfit for their duty as soldiers, and therefore a useless expense to the State, from what the majority of our medical officers call preventible disease. These figures, and those given in Lord Onslow's Report, alarming as I think, my Lords, you must consider them, for they show that one-fourth of the 70,000 soldiers serving in India are unable to take the field from contagious disease and its consequent disabilities, cannot be gainsaid. And they further prove how fallacious is the argument urged by the opponents of the Contagious Diseases Act, that the protective regulations enforced under that Act failed to mitigate the evil which caused them to be introduced. I know, my Lords, that those regulations did not work all the good that was hoped for, but this was not the fault of the regulations, but of the half-hearted manner in which they were applied. So apathetically were they brought into force that, although the Cantonment Act which legalised the regulations was passed in 1864, it was not until 1869, five years later, that Fort William and its environs were protected, although this is certainly the station most in need of precautionary measures on account of its immediate proximity to the City of Calcutta. Up to the last, 12 military stations in Bengal were left unprotected, and at three of those stations in 1879 the number of admissions to hospitals from contagious disease actually rose to upwards of 700 per 1,000 men. I think, my Lords, you must agree with me that it speaks well for the benefiical results of the Act that, notwithstanding these astounding figures were included in the total number of registered cases during the year, the proportion of men invalided was, as I have already shown, nearly four times greater in 1894 and 1895 than it was in 1879 and 1880. The truth is, my Lords, the Contagious Diseases Act was never given a fair trial in India. It was not believed in by the authority responsible to the Government of India for its being properly carried out, and, in consequence, no attempt was ever made to investigate the working of the Act or to ascertain what cases of disease were contracted within the area to which the Act applied, and what cases were contracted outside that area; so that even if every station in India had been brought within the scope of the Act, the good really done by the Act could not have been correctly appreciated from the returns furnished by the sanitary commissioner. Tables prepared from such unreliable data were bound to bring the Act into disrepute, and to strengthen the arguments of those who were, and are still, opposed to its introduction. Then, again, my Lords, the Act was administered in some places with zeal and intelligence by medical officers, in others it was carried on in a very perfunctory manner. When visiting Lock Hospitals I invaiably found that success was complete when the medical officer in charge took an interest in his work and satisfied himself that those who came for treatment were properly looked after. The disease under such auspices diminished rapidly, and at one station, where it had been extremely prevalent, it was almost entirely stamped out owing to the exertions of the medical officer. I am well aware, my Lords, that those who are opposed to the enforcement of the Contagious Diseases Act contend that direct interference is adverse to morality, and that, in all justice, the sinner should be allowed to reap the punishment of his sin. Although to my mind this is not a very Christian doctrine, I can understand and respect the horror of wrong-doing of which it is the outcome, provided the punishment could be confined to the sinner himself; but what I cannot understand is how any one can think it right to take no measures to prevent the spread of an evil which involves disease and misery on innocent women and children, and which must seriously injure equally innocent generations in the future. In my opinion it is as bad or worse than it would be to allow a mad dog to bite as many people as he felt inclined, or to permit a person known to have smallpox or diphtheria to mix freely with people in health. I say worse, because the evil in such cases might, at all events, be limited to those bitten or infected; while, in the other, it is impossible to calculate how far-reaching will be the deadly results of neglecting to take precautions. My Lords, we have to deal with human nature, and, in considering the question at issue, we must not lose sight of the fact that, year by year, several thousand young men, mere boys, indeed—freed from all moral restraint, arrive in India and are at once subject to great and peculiar temptations. For many months of the year they are necessarily kept within barracks from sunrise to sunset, only to emerge when darkness, which comes on so rapidly in the East, prohibits anything in the shape of such healthy recreation as out-door games. A great deal has been done of late years by the Government of India to enable the men to amuse themselves in a rational manner, by poviding comfortable and attractive reading-rooms, coffee shops, etc. These regimental institutes, as they are called, have helped to raise the tone of our soldies and to reduce crime, especially drunkenness, but they seem to have had, I regret to say, but little effect in preventing contagious disease, which, though it might have assumed still more gigantic proportions, had these counter-attractions not been provided, has, notwithstanding all that has been done in this direction, gone on steadily increasing, as your Lordships will perceive from Lord Onslow's Committee's Report. Other and more direct measures should now be resorted to. The disease under consideration ought to be treated as all other contagious diseases are treated. It is even more essential that precautionary measures should be adopted in regard to it than to any other disease, for, as stated in the Report of the Royal College of Physicians, dated March 23 last,

> "The constitutional form of the disease is one of the most serious, insidious, and lasting of all the contagious diseases that afflict humanity."

When it is prevalent there should be periodical examinations of all unmarried soldiers during their first period of service, and of older soldiers, if thought necessary, and any infringement of the order requiring men to report themselves on the first sign of becoming affected, should be severely punished. There ought to be no doubt as to the intention of these orders in the Army Regulations, but I am afraid that they are now frequently lost sight of and the importance of strictly enforcing them not thoroughly appreciated. With regard to women, I would leave the matter in the hands of the Government of India, on the distinct understanding, as stated in the Secretatry of State's Dispatch that "there must be nothing which can be represented as an encouragement to vice." In the interests of morality, and to protect, as far as is possible, young soldiers from temptation, women professedly belonging to a certain class should be forbidden to reside in regimental bazaars or follow regiments on the line of march. And in every military station all women, professionals or otherwise, known to have communicated disease to any soldier, should be obliged to submit to medical treatment and subsequent periodical examinations or to quit the station and its immediate neighbourhood. Each case of expulsion should be carried out in communication with the local civil authorities, who will, I trust, be empowered to take such further action as may be considered necessary for the protection of the community at large. To limit the Contagious Diseases Act (or whatever regulations the Government of India may think proper to introduce) to cantonments and to exclude the neighbouring cities and towns would, in my opinion, be altogether insufficient, and would certainly not get at the root of the evil. There must, of course, be some punishment, such as fine or imprisonment, for disobedience of orders, but my belief is that it would seldom have to be enforced if the women are kindly treated in the Government hospitals. The employment of women as coolies in the construction and repairs of barracks should be discouraged, but where this kind of labour is unavoidable, special precautions should be taken by means of civil and regimental police. These are surely only reasonable preventive measures, in the enforcement of which there should be little difficulty, for the calling of every person in a cantonment in India is well known. Boundary pillars mark off the space set apart for the soldiers' barracks, parade ground, and officers' quarters, and within these limits, at any rate, it is our bounden duty to protect the health of our soldiers, who, we must remember, are cut off from the pleasures and enjoyments of home life, and are compelled to live as single men for a certain number of years. If there is reason to suspect that the disease is contracted outside the cantonment limits, the country round should be put out of bounds and the number of men on duty as regimental police should be increased until matters improve. I have myself found this an effective way of checking the spread of this terrible scourge. I believe that much valuable assistance might be afforded by military chaplains if they would interest themselves in the matter. An excellent example has been set by the Rev. John Crauford, a Presbyterian clergyman at Meerut, who, a few years ago, established a "Purity Society" at that station for the benefit of soldiers, many of whom joined it, with the happiest results both as regards health and conduct. Something also might be gained by warning young and inexperienced soldiers, on first arrival in India, of the aggravated effects of immorality in such a climate, and its appalling results as can be seen at Netley Hospital. I am certain, too, that medical officers would be able to do a great deal towards the desired end if they were brought into closer communication with troops than they are at present. ["Hear, hear!"] They never now see or know the men as they did formerly, except those who come to them for treatment in hospital; and the cordial intercourse which used to exist between the combatant and medical officers and which was so conducive to good fellowship and to the general health of the Army—[*cheers*]—is, unfortunately, a thing of the past. I trust, my Lords, I have not wearied you. [*Cries of* "No!"] My excuse for taking up so much of your time is that the efficiency of the Army and the moral and material well-being of the soldiers I love so well are at stake. I beg you, my Lords, to give this painful subject your most careful consideration, and I earnestly hope that the British public may be induced to look upon it from a wise and prudent, as well as from a merciful and Christian point of view. [*Cheers.*]

*THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I am grateful to the noble Earl and the gallant General for the way in which they have handled what is unquestionably a very difficult subject. I do not think it can be denied that the disease and its effects have come to such a point that it is impossible to refuse a thorough inquiry into the whole matter. I do not think it is possible to read the papers which have been distributed to Members of this House without feeling that it is the imperative duty of the Legislature to look into the matter and see what ought to be done. ["Hear, hear!"] I think there is one class of of consideration which has not received full attention in either of the speeches we have listened to; it is quite certain that you cannot get to the root of such an evil as this without giving a very large part of your attention to the moral side of the whole question. The old regulations were objected to, and not a moment too soon, because they unquestionably had the effect of giving the impression to the soldiers that the sin in which they were indulging was not anything very wrong in itself, and that it was the business and purpose of the Government not to stamp the sin as an evil, but only to stop the effects of it. I do not think there can be any doubt that that was the only impression which could be made upon the soldiers at the time when it was the custom to provide for the indulgence of this sin by special establishments. It was a long time ago, but there still remains the same kind of impression. The authorities should make it very clear that they look upon this kind of indulgence as a very evil thing which is to be condemned by every good man and by every good soldier. If you can change the tone of the Army in that respect you will have done something towards getting rid of the evil. It can never be done by mere regulations, and if your regulations are of such a character as to maintain the belief that you do not really care about the wrong of the self-indulgence, and that you only want to have soldiers who can fight, depend upon it all your regulations will fall short of really extirpating the mischief. It is the habitual and continued indulgence that keeps up this mischief, and the temptation is increased by barrack-room conversation and the way in which the soldiers regard the sin itself. As long as that is the case you cannot have the co-operation of the men themselves in getting rid of the evil, and without their own co-operation it is hopeless to endeavour to raise any class of men to a higher position. If you leave out all this moral consideration, and think only of sanitary regulations as if they were really the complete remedy, every now and then you will find that your sanitary regulations will altogether fail. If there is to be an Inquiry it ought to go beyond the mere examination of the sanitary regulations that may be made, and should consider how you can get at the soldier's conscience and his habits of life. How very much more might be done, for instance, if a larger number of men were allowed to marry. It would no doubt cost you money, but it will not cost you as much as the present evil costs you. Something has been done, no doubt, to employ the soldiers and to keep their minds away from that sensuality which, when once men have allowed their imaginations to be affected by it, is sure to constantly recur to their minds. More may be done by occupying them in employment agreeable and interesting to them in their idle moments, and a great deal more than has yet been tried should be tried in this regard. I am only using this as an illustration of what I mean. I do not mean there are not many other things I could mention myself that could be done with this view. But what I want to emphasise is that in all that is done the moral impress made on the troops is to be one of the first considerations, and that whatever regulations you make you are doing, perhaps, benefit for the moment, but certain mischief for the future if you let soldiers think you do not care whether they are moral or not. ["Hear, hear!"] I think, my Lords, an Inquiry which looked into this side of the matter, with as much care as a medical man would naturally bestow upon the material side, an Inquiry of that kind would really be of great benefit. I do not propose to move any Amendment to the Resolution, or to vote against it. I believe that such an Inquiry as the noble Lord proposes, if only it be conducted by men who will look at both sides of the matter, and will be thorough-going in looking at the moral side, may be of the greatest benefit. Lord Kinnaird proposes to add something to the Resolution. The noble Lord seemed to deprecate the addition. I confess I do not see why it should be said such an addition will in any way interfere with the Inquiry proposed. It seems to me that if your Inquiry is to be of permanent value, you must extend it to the whole subject. My Lords, I cannot sit down without expressing my strong sense of deep gratitude to those who have brought this matter forward. I believe they have done no more than their duty. I believe that we may safely follow their lead, if only we are careful to see that the Inquiry proposed shall not be confined entirely to physical considerations, which will be dealing, not with the root of the evil, but only with the symptoms of it, and which will leave untouched that out of which the whole thing comes. If we can have an Inquiry which will avoid that, I believe it will be of the greatest use. My Lords, these young men who are so readily tempted to fall, come often from country villages, from the artisan class in the towns. They often have not lived very excellent lives before they enlist. Nevertheless, you do not find among them anything like the mischief you are now finding in your Army. And why? Because they have so much else to occupy their minds, because the moral influences around them are so much higher than the moral influences they find among their comrades when they join their regiments. They are protected by their surroundings, and soldiers are not. Look to it, and see whether something may not be done, something very real, to raise the whole tone of the Service in this matter. Lord Roberts pointed out to us various particulars in which he plainly aimed at that purpose. I thank him. I only wish to emphasise what he has said, and to press upon you that it is in that direction you must look if you desire to obtain permanent benefit. [*Cheers.*]

*The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (The Earl of Onslow) said he welcomed the contribution to the Debate that had just fallen from the most rev. Prelate, because he gathered from his remarks that he entirely agreed in the opinion already expressed that the magnitude of the mischief done was such that some steps must be speedily taken to put an end, if possible, to so terrible an evil. But when he joined with Lord Dunraven in desiring an Inquiry, he would suggest that the time for inquiry was past, and the time for action had arrived. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped Lord Dunraven would not persist in his Motion for two reasons—first, because he thought any exhaustive Inquiry by a Committee or Commission might have the effect of leading some of those who were not prepared to take immediate action to point to the proceedings of the Inquiry as a reason for delay. Secondly, he hoped the Motion would not be pressed, because he hardly knew in what direction it would be possible to produce more facts or figures than those already available. The amount of literature on the subject was something overwhelming. Lord Dunraven asked that an Inquiry should be held into the effect of contagious disease on the forces of the Crown. Every year the Army Medical Department issued a Report which dealt with the affliction of the troops from these diseases in all parts of Her Majesty's dominions, whether they were Europeans, Asiatics, or Africans. Lord Dunraven desired that an Inquiry should be held into the effect of the disease upon the civil population. In the course of the Inquiry to which allusion had already been made he endeavoured to obtain from the principal hospitals in London and the large towns of England some information as to the proportion of these diseases to others, their influence upon others, and the increase of hereditary disease. But he found that statistics were not kept on these heads, and in many instances cases of venereal disease were not admitted. But if the noble Earl desired to find out what was the effect of the disease on the civil population, he had only to ask the superintendents of workhouses or the matrons of the women's hospitals or of the sick children's hospitals, or visit, he was sorry to say, the graves in our country churchyards, to be at once informed that the evil was rapidly increasing throughout the country. As to its effect on native races throughout Her Majesty's dominions, no fewer than five large volumes had been presented to Parliament, the result of inquiries made by governors and medical officers in all our colonies. Lord Dunraven asked for the regulations here and in other countries. The regulations in Great Britain were set forth in the Report of the Commitee of the House of Commons in 1882, and in the Inquiry he himself recently held he obtained from our Ambassadors abroad a statement of the regulations in existence in each of the European countries and also the regulations affecting the troops of those countries. If Lord Dunraven would be content with a Return giving that information, he would have pleasure in laying it on the Table, and he trusted that he would see that no further Inquiry was necessary. He would inform the House what had been the course of affairs during the last few years in India. In 1889 a new Cantonment Act was passed in consequence of a Resolution of the House of Commons in 1888. In 1892 instructions were issued by the Government of India for the strict observance of the rules under that Act. It was claimed that those rules were not strictly observed, and Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, while declaring that the Government of India at least had loyally carried out the Resolution of the House of Commons, said that local authorities might in some instances have evaded orders. In 1894 the Secretary for India ordered the introduction into the Viceroy's Council of a new Act to amend the Cantonments Act of 1889, and further rules eliminating this particular class of diseases from the infectious and contagious disorders, sufferers from which might be expelled from the cantonments, and imposing a fine or imprisonment on any public servant subjecting women to compulsory examination. The Government of India strongly protested against that course and said it was necessary to have power to exclude diseased women from the cantonments, or at any rate they must have power to exclude persons without giving a reason. But the Secretary of State was unable to agree in this view, and his sanction was refused to any rules which would have that effect. So matters remained until recently, when public attention was forcibly drawn to the alarming increase of the disease in India and its appalling consequences. Upon that the Secretary of State had written a Dispatch in which most Members of the House would be prepared to agree, and he should like to dwell on one or two of the conditions laid down, because he believed they would go a long way to meet not only the views of Lord Roberts, but also of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Government said they could not acquiesce in the continuance of the present state of things, and that common humanity, no less than their duty to the large body of British troops in India, demanded that some measures should be taken to restrain the prevalence of venereal disease. The Dispatch went on to say that there were certain things which must not be done—that was to say, there should be no approach to what had been called official purveying for immorality, but it gave power to the Government of India to expel from cantonments persons suffering from these diseases. It was quite true the result might be that there might be examination of women in some cases, but it would not be, as it was in the former case, compulsory, except in the same degree as it was now compulsory when a person suffered from smallpox, scarlet fever, or any of those diseases which the community had long since recognised to be a danger to public health. There were certain other measures which the Secretary of State had not yet prescribed, but which he had in his Dispatch invited advice from the Government of India upon. The first of these related to the taking of precautions to see that women were not employed about the barracks in the manner which Lord Roberts had shown had proved such a danger to the health of the soldiers. In the second place, the Secretary of State expressed to the Viceroy his desire to co-operate with him in every way in improving the moral and physical condition of the soldier. That was no new departure. For many years the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief had been doing their best to improve the moral conditon of the soldier, and no one had done more than the noble and gallant Lord who had addressed their Lordships, and who had not only shown himself to be an incomparable captain in leading Her Majesty's forces against an Asiatic enemy, but had endeared himself to the common soldiers in India by the efforts which he had successfully made to improve their condition in all the commands he had held in that dependency. ["Hear, hear!"] He agreed with the most rev. Prelate that there was an opening not only for chaplains, but also for the commanding officers, to take this opportunity of inculcating upon the men under their command not only—as the Secretary of State had requested—the measures for the preservation of their health, but also impressing upon them the sin and wickedness of indulging in these vices. The Secretary of State desired that the practice which was already in existence of warning young soldiers by regimental and medical officers of the risks they ran should in future be made universal. He had every reason to believe that the measures which the Secretary of State proposed to take would be efficacious, and the Viceroy had telegraphed on behalf of the Indian Government that the proposals of the Government

> "Are in accord with our views, and, if sanctioned, will, we hope, enable us to combat successfully the spread of the disease."

One other important point the Dispatch dealt with was the remarkable fact that in some cantonments the disease had decreased, while in others it had increased to a great extent. It was not quite clear what was the reason for that variation between different stations, but he was inclined to agree with the explanation which had been suggested by Lord Roberts. The Government of India had been asked for further information upon this point. There was no reason to believe that women in India, any more than anywhere else, did not desire to be treated in hospital and regain their health, and he could not see upon what ground of Christian charity they could in any way say that the prevention of disease was not one of the first duties of a Government. ["Hear, hear!"] But how could they cure and how could they prevent disease if that disease was concealed? ["Hear, hear!"] It seemed to him the only course was to treat it like all other disease and compel the immediate notification of it. Some of those who, not long ago were most bitterly ranged against any preventive regulation now admitted that the time had arrived when something must be done. Their Lordships might have observed the letter in *The Times* from Lady Henry Somerset, in which she recognised that this horrible scourge had brought upon thousands of innocent women in England a load of suffering, and said that she gladly welcomed the Dispatch of the Secretary of State as a statement of inspiring and controlling principles never yet professed by any previous Government. That was not an isolated instance. A memorial had been presented to the Secretary of State and would shortly be made public, signed by a very large number of ladies of the highest position, philanthropists, nurses, superintendents, and matrons of hospitals, wives of doctors and clergymen, all praying that immediate action might be taken to check the spread of this terrible disease and the ravages it was inflicting among the population at home. They stated that preventive measures, if exercised with scrupulous care, did not cause any real danger to women, but constituted a valuable safeguard to women's virtue, and afforded a great opportunity of escape from a life of vice. He earnestly hoped the noble Earl would not press his Motion; but, whatever the result of that Debate might be, Her Majesty's Government felt that the time for action had arrived, and that it was necessary at once to take such steps as might seem to the Government of India and the Government in this country most likely to make a real and efficacious diminution in the disease. ["Hear, hear!"]

*LORD REAY said that he would move the adjournment of the Debate, if there was no objection on the part of the Government, as several noble Lords were anxious to speak on the subject.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE replied that the Government had no objection to the adjournment of the Debate, which would be resumed as the first Order on Monday.

Debate accordingly adjourned to Monday next.

RAILWAY ASSESSORS (SCOTLAND) SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY (TRANSFER OF PATRONAGE) BILL.

Read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

House Adjourned at a Quarter before Eight o'Clock, to Monday next, a Quarter before Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

On the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of this Bill,

MR. D. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) said that the Measure included five Provisional Orders, four of which related to England and one to Ireland. He had no objection to make to the confirmation of the English Provisional Orders, but he did object to the confirmation of that which related to Killala.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member opposes the Bill, it will be postponed until another day.

MR. CRILLY wished to ask, on a point of Order, whether if the Bill were postponed, he would be allowed to state his objections to the Measure when it came before the House on a future occasion.

*MR. SPEAKER: Certainly, the hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity of stating the grounds of his objections to the Bill.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) asked whether he would be in order in moving an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill?

*MR. SPEAKER: The notice of the Instruction can be given, but the Instruction cannot be moved now.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

QUESTIONS.

CAPE GARRISON.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if a Roman Catholic chaplain accompanied the Irish troops now on their way to South Africa; and, was a Presbyterian clergyman sent with the Seaforth Highlanders to Crete?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Chaplains are not, as a rule, sent with troops proceeding to a colony. Officiating clergymen of the required denomination are employed in the colony to whatever extent may be found necessary. There are no Army chaplains of any denomination in South Africa. A Presbyterian clergyman was sent with the Seaforth Highlanders to Crete as there was no probability of finding there a clergyman who could officiate.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked why a distinction was drawn in this matter in favour of the Presbyterians and against the Roman Catholics?

MR. BRODRICK: Because the soldiers who happened to be sent to Crete were Presbyterians, and if soldiers of other denominations had been sent there we should have sent chaplains of those denominations.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Here are 800 Roman Catholic soldiers sent to South Africa. Why should not they have a Roman Catholic chaplain just as the Presbyterians who were sent to Crete have a Presbyterian chaplain?

Mr. BRODRICK: A Presbyterian chaplain was sent because there was not one in Crete. Had an Irish regiment been sent to the island a Roman Catholic chaplain would have been sent with it.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Here are 800 Roman Catholic soldiers sent to South Africa without——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is arguing upon the answer. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War how many of the 189 men and 272 horses drafted from other batteries to complete the three batteries under orders for the Cape were taken from the two batteries on the higher establishment and on the roster for foreign service; whether, although the 189 men and 272 horses were taken from 20 different batteries, no less than 27 horses and 53 men were taken from the 19th and 73rd field batteries, both of which were already under strength; and whether in case another brigade division be required for foreign service, it will be necessary to make up by drafts 63 per cent. of the men and nearly 90 per cent. of the horses required?

Mr. BRODRICK: Thirty-two men and 27 horses were transferred from the two batteries on the higher establishment, and those batteries were slightly under strength. Although 272 horses were taken from home batteries, 116 were met by exchange of horses from the batteries going abroad, those horses not being thought the best for foreign service. Only 156, therefore, were really taken from the home batteries, representing 38 per cent. of the strength of horses in the three batteries for South Africa. The men drafted from home batteries were 38 per cent. As batteries on foreign service require more men and horses than high-strength batteries at home, some transfers are inevitable.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the whole of his Question.

Mr. BRODRICK said that he believed he had done so.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER repeated a part of his Question as it stood upon the Paper.

Mr. BRODRICK said that all the material parts of the Question were replied to in his answer.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER rose amid loud cries of "Oh" and "Order" from Nationalist Members.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: I rise to order, Mr. Speaker. We are stopped in putting questions, but the hon. Member opposite is allowed to go on. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member for North Louth is entirely out of order in making suggestions of that kind. [*Cheers.*] The hon. Member was stopped because he was arguing upon an answer. The hon. Member for West Belfast, as I understand, is strictly confining himself so far to the Question upon the Paper, and is stating that that Question has not been answered.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: He has risen four times. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. J. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.), who rose amid loud cries of "Order!" said, "Order yourselves!" [*Renewed cries of* "Order!"]

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

LOUGH MASK AND BALLINROBE CANAL.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if any decision has been come to with regard to the grant for the Lough Mask and Ballinrobe Canal?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): No decision has yet been arrived at in this matter, which will be brought before the Congested Districts Board at its next meeting. I ought, perhaps, to add that the fuller reports received since the last Question of the hon. and learned Member on the 5th April are not altogether favourable to the project.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

Major RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Department would allow managers to give an extra week's holiday during Jubilee week, as an exceptional case, without endangering the grants under Article 83 because the schools were not opened 400 times?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): In ordinary cases the managers could easily give an extra week's holiday and still make 400 openings. Very exceptional cases, if any, would be dealt with on their merits.

COLONEL DALBIAC (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether arrangements can be made for the minor officials and messengers of the House of Commons to view the Jubilee Procession on the 22nd of June, as was done in 1887?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. A. AKERS - DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am sorry to say that I cannot promise accommodation for the whole staff of the House to view the Queen's Procession. The arrangement of 1887 alluded to was a private one. If my hon. and gallant Friend can approach me with any similar proposal I will do what I can to meet him.

MR. MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether a son of the Sultan of Turkey is coming to this country to take part in the Jubilee rejoicings; and if so, at whose invitation is the visit to be undertaken?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understand that the Sultan has, through the British Ambassador at Constantinople, announced his intention of sending a mission over on the occasion of the Jubilee. No invitations were issued.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES (SITES).

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works when it is proposed to summon the Committee on Government Offices (Sites)?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: In reply to the Question of the right hon. Baronet, I have to say that the Committee on Government Offices (Appropriation of Sites) will be called to choose a Chairman and to take evidence on Wednesday next.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. W. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if his attention has been drawn to the resolution passed by the Clifden Board of Guardians, in which they complain of the very serious inconvenience occasioned by the fact that the mail arrives in Clifden an hour or more later every morning since 1st May, thus seriously affecting the delivery of letters through all parts of Connemara, and rendering it difficult. if not impossible, to reply to correspondence on the same day; and, whether he will take the necessary steps to remedy this state of affairs?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): Clifden cannot benefit, as most of the rest of Ireland does, by the accelerated day mail, because, though that reaches Galway 54 minutes earlier than it did, the car could still only reach Clifden about 7 p.m. too late for the return mail to leave the same day. It is, therefore, dependent upon the night mail which leaves Dublin and arrives at Galway 50 minutes later than formerly, in order to include the mails sent from other parts of Ireland via Dublin. The evening mail from Dublin to England is now 50 minutes later, and the mails to Dublin have been made 50 minutes later in order to share in this advantage.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that there was a line of railway running in close proximity to Clifden?

MR. HANBURY said that was so, but the trains ran at very inconvenient times.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will inquire from the Great Northern Railway Company the cause of the delay of the mid-day mails for Belturbet at Ballyhaise Junction; whether he is aware that the Cavan mails reach Cavan half an hour earlier than the Belturbet mails reach Belturbet, although the distance to Cavan from Ballyhaise Junction is longer than to Belturbet from the same junction; and, whether, if this is caused by any special train arrangement, or by shunting, or the like, he will ask the railway company to alter the arrangements?

MR. HANBURY: The mid-day mails for Belturbet are not, it appears, delayed at Ballyhaise Junction, but arrive at Belturbet at 11.10 a.m., only five minutes later than at Cavan. This is due to an alteration in the time tables, of which the London Post Office had no information when I stated on Tuesday last that the train reach Belturbet at 11.35—the time also stated in "Bradshaw." This means an addition of twenty-five minutes to the increased interval between the arrival and departure of the mail at Belturbet.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, with reference to the tenders recently invited by the Post Office for the conveyance of mails between Kinsale and Ballinhassig, could he state what the amount of the accepted tender was, and whether any lower tender was sent in; and, if so, what its amount was, and why it was not accepted?

MR. HANBURY: The lowest tender was accepted for the service in question, but the Postmaster General is not prepared to state the amount.

BROOKEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if he will direct a Return to be made to this House of the summons directed to James Kirkpatrick, on a charge of tracing hares, armed with a gun, which charge was heard and adjudicated on at Brookeborough, on the 2nd March 1897: together with the names of the magistrates who heard and decided the case, the name or names of the complainant or complainants, the names of the witnesses examined, and the penalty imposed?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): No good purpose would be served by granting the Return referred to. I must therefore decline to direct it. Any party interested can obtain a copy of the entry in the order book of the magistrates, which contains all the particulars mentioned in the Question, and if as I have already stated in answer to a Question of the hon. Member, Kirkpatrick be in a position to show that any of the adjudicating magistrates were disqualified by interest, he can take proceedings to have the conviction quashed.

HONITON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (HOLY WEEK).

MR. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that on a day in Holy Week, and during school hours, the children in the only public elementary school in Honiton were marched through the town to a Church of England service, some of them being the children of Nonconformists who have claimed for them the benefit of the Conscience Clause, and who were not aware of the intention to take the children to the service; and, whether the Department will take steps to prevent the compulsory attendance of children at religious services in places of worship?

SIR J. GORST: The Committee of Council have no information on the subject, and have received no complaints.

CORK AND TRALEE PRISONS.

Mr. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain on what grounds 21 prisoners were transferred from Cork City Prison to Tralee Prison in December 1896; and, what is the cost to the Kerry ratepayers by the transfer of the prisoners and the escort of constabulary that accompanied them?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There was nothing unusual in the movement of prisoners referred to; such transfers are effected from time to time when it is considered desirable to equalise prison populations. The expenses of transfer in all such cases, including cost of constabulary escort, are borne by the Prisons Vote.

ORMATHWAITE PROPERTY (LISTOWEL).

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that all the evicted tenants on the Ormathwaite property, situate near Listowel, have been reinstated with the exception of Thomas Walsh, although he has made the same offer for reinstatement as the others; and, on what grounds has his application for reinstatement been refused?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Three of the holdings from which the former tenants were evicted on this property, still remain unoccupied. I have no means of knowing on what grounds the landlord acted in refusing the application of Walsh for reinstatement.

MR. FLAVIN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that this man was the only exception on the whole property, that he had made an application to be reinstated and that no ground had been given for the refusal to reinstate him?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that if no ground for the refusal to reinstate the man had been given he did not see how he could be expected to give one.

MR. FLAVIN asked why the extra police were kept on the property at the cost of the ratepayers?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said he supposed that the extra police were kept on the property in the interests of peace. He had no further information to give on the subject.

MR. FLAVIN said that he should call further attention to the matter.

POSTAL DELIVERIES (IRELAND).

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, how it is intended to have house to house deliveries carried out in rural districts of Ireland; when will the new arrangements come into operation; and, when will rural auxiliaries get their pay for Sunday duty?

MR. HANBURY: Deliveries to unserved houses in rural districts of Ireland will be afforded partly by extending the walks of existing postmen and partly by employing additional postmen. The work will be put in hand without delay, but it will necessarily take some time to complete. The rate of pay for Sunday duty, *i.e.*, payment at a rate and a half recommended by Lord Tweedmouth's Committee, will in all cases date from the 1st of April 1897.

DISCHARGE OF WEAVERS (BURNLEY).

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE (Burnley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the particulars of the case reported in the local press where two sisters, young women employed in a weaving shed in the town of Burnley, one of whom, having been discharged without notice for reasons she thought insufficient, brought an action against the employers for wages in lieu of notice, and the employers, the day before the date fixed for the trial, paid the full claim and costs; whether he is aware that on the following day notice to quit was given by the employers to the other sister, without any cause of complaint whatever assigned against her, who, in spite of her repeated requests, refuse to give any reason to her in explanation of her discharge; and, whether he will cause inquiries to be made into the case?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): The attention of the Secretary of State has not been called to this case except by the hon. Member's Question. There is no suggestion in the facts which the hon. Member states of any offence against the law having been committed, and this being so I am afraid there is nothing which calls for an inquiry on the part of the Secretary of State. It is obviously impossible for him to undertake to inquire into every case where workpeople are alleged to have been harshly treated by their employers, and even if he made inquiries he would have no power to interfere.

ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY.

MR. R. COX (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been directed to a resolution passed by a majority of the University Court of St. Andrews on the 10th February 1897, suspending the operation of certain ordinances made by the University Commissioners, and confirmed by the Privy Council on the 15th January 1897, till the commencement of the next academical year; and whether the action of the University Court in suspending the effect of ordinances confirmed by the Privy Council is in accordance with law; and, if not, what steps the Executive Government intend to take in order to obviate the prejudicial effect to the University of St. Andrews and to University College, Dundee, of the said resolution?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): It having been brought to the notice of the Secretary for Scotland that certain individuals intended to test in the law courts the legality of the decision of the Privy Council with reference to the disputed ordinances, the opinion of the English and Scottish Law Officers of the Crown was taken, and acting on that opinion the Secretary for Scotland is now in consultation with the Treasury as to the course to be followed.

DOG LICENCE (DRUMLITHIE, KINCARDINESHIRE).

MR. J. W. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that Alexander Murray, who occupies the croft of Bogside, Drumlithie, Kincardineshire, and lets the farm as pasture for some 40 or 50 sheep, which he has to look after, has this year been refused an exemption from dog licence; and whether, seeing that the exemption has been granted for two years under similar circumstances, he will explain on what ground it is now refused?

MR. HANBURY: I understand that Mr. Murray is a tailor who is tenant of about eight acres of pasture. He owns no stock himself, but lets the pasture for sheep during the summer and autumn months. The field is well fenced, and the sheep are brought to it, and removed, when necessary, by the owners themselves. Mr. Murray was found to be in possession of a dog on the 3rd of March, and, as he declined to take out a licence, the Board of Inland Revenue considered that the case was one in which proceedings should be taken. It is true that an exemption was granted to Mr. Murray for the past year, but, now that the facts of the case are fully before the Board, they do not feel justified in continuing it.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the event of the dropping of the Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill, he can make any statement as to the way in which the Irish Government propose to use the money voted by Parliament as the Irish share of the aid grant for relief of rating in England; whether this sum is suspended simpliciter, or is at interest for the Irish benefit pending its appropriation; and whether any representation has reached him as to the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire into the best means to be taken for spending the sum, or will it continue to remain as last year, in case the Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill fails to pass?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A Question similar to this stands on the Paper for to-day addressed to my right hon. Friend, the First Lord of the Treasury, by the hon. Member for West Islington. I understand my right hon. Friend will be prepared to make a statement on the subject, if not to-day, at all events in the near future. I must ask the hon. Member to wait for that statement.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Technical Education Committee of a county or county borough, or in a county borough a school board supplying and managing higher grade and organised science schools, will be regarded as an organisation for the promotion of secondary education within the meaning of Section 7 of the Revised Science and Art Directory?

SIR J. GORST: The language of Section 7 was purposely left general by the Committee, and I do not think the interpretation put upon it by the Question would apply in all cases.

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA (HEALTH).

MR. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received any representative memorials or petitions from the general public on the subject of the proposals contained in his Dispatch of 26th March 1897 for improving the health of the British troops in India; and, if so whether he has any objection to make them public?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have received only two memorials which can be held to be representative of general public opinion on the subject of my Dispatch of 26th March 1897 regarding the health of British troops in India, and I have no objection to make them public. A few memorials have also been received from local meetings and societies, embodying protests against the action taken by Her Majesty's Government.

SEED POTATOES SUPPLY (IRELAND) ACT 1895.

MR. JOHN HAMMOND (Carlow): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Carlow Board of Guardians were compelled to pay to the Board of Works, Ireland, a fine of £15 15s. because of the delay of 10 days in repayment of the first instalment of a loan under the Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Act 1895; that this delay was caused solely by the absence of the clerk of the union on extended leave of absence owing to illness; and will he, having regard to the circumstances of this case, order that this sum of £15 15s. shall be refunded to the Carlow Board of Guardians?

MR. HANBURY: The charge in question is not a fine, but a charge for collection (of 1s. in the pound) levied under Section 6 of the Public Works Loans Act 1892 in cases where the repayment is more than 31 days overdue. I have repeatedly explained that interest on these seed loans is payable not by the Guardians but by the Church Fund, so if the fees for collection were not enforced, there would be little inducement to the Guardians to repay the loans. In this case the instalment (£315) was due on 31st July 1896. The Guardians were informed on that date that the fees would become due if it was not paid within 31 days. They met every Thursday during that period, and the clerk was absent on only two of them. Even if he had been absent on each of the four Thursdays, there is no reason why such a pressing matter of ordinary business should not have been brought before the Guardians by a subordinate. I see no special reason for making any exception in this case.

In reply to further questions asked by Mr. HAMMOND and Mr. FLYNN,

MR. HANBURY said that the instalments became payable in the month of August, and that it was a statutory charge.

HIGH SHERIFF (CARRICKFERGUS).

MR. RICHARD M. DANE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether his attention has been called to the recent trial before the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland of an information at the suit of the Irish Attorney-General against Captain Conway Higginson for declining the office of High Sheriff of the county and town of Carrickfergus; and (2) whether it is the intention of the Government to deal with the question of the appointment to the office of Sheriff in Ireland during the present Session of Parliament.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The whole subject is now under the consideration of the Government, but I cannot, at present, make any statement in the matter.

WORMWOOD SCRUBS.

*MR. W. E. T. SHARPE (Kensington, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what decision has been arrived at by the War Department regarding a proposal to open a path across Wormwood Scrubbs, submitted by the London County Council on 26th October last?

MR. BRODRICK: The question of a path across the drilling ground at Wormwood Scrubbs presents considerable difficulty, but I hope to be able to communicate a decision to the London County Council in a few days.

POTATO CROP (IRELAND).

MR. P. McDERMOTT (Kilkenny, N): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) if his attention has been called to the extremely unfavourable prospects of the potato crop in Ireland; (2) whether he is aware that in many cases where the seed has been planted it has perished from the excessive rain, and that in nearly every district in Ireland the potato planting is a month later than usual; and (3) whether, as a recurrence of the potato disease may be obviated by spraying the crops, he will take steps in the poorer districts in Ireland to provide the necessary materials for those who are unable to obtain them, thereby preventing the serious risk of another potato famine in Ireland?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It is a fact, I understand, that the planting of potato seed has been later than usual this season owing to the long continued wet weather, and I believe there is reason to fear that in some localities the seed has been injured by excessive rain. It is entirely premature, however, to express any opinion respecting the prospects of the crop generally. As regards the third paragraph, the matter will be brought under the notice of the Congested Districts Board.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the south of Ireland a large portion of the potato seed has failed?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir; I am not aware that that is the fact.

JOINT BURIAL COMMITTEES.

MR. J. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that legal difficulties have been raised with regard to the exercise of borrowing powers by Joint Burial Committees appointed under Section 53 of the Local Government Act 1894, and that, in answer to an application from the Horsham Burial District Joint Committee, the Board stated in August of last year that legislation would be necessary to meet those difficulties; and if the necessary legislation will be undertaken by the Government in the course of the present Session?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Local Government Board are aware that legal difficulties have arisen in connection with the matter referred to and the question of legislation on the subject is receiving consideration.

PERFORMING BEARS (STREETS).

COLONEL DALBIAC: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the numerous accidents which have recently resulted from the exhibition of performing bears in the streets of London and elsewhere; and whether there exists any law or police order under which these exhibitions can be put a stop to?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: No such accidents have been reported to the Metropolitan Police or been brought to the notice of the Secretary of State from other districts. The matter is one which is provided for by law, and in regard to which the Metropolitan Police have suitable instructions.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a copy of the Edict issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar relating to the abolition of slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba early in April will be laid at an early date upon the Table.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): Yes, Sir. A copy of the Decree will be presented almost immediately.

WESTMINSTER HALL.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether it has been brought to his notice that during the Easter Recess many excursionists were disappointed through Westminster Hall being closed to the public except on Monday and Tuesday; and whether he will consider the advisability of permitting the public to view the Hall between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. during the whole of the Whitsuntide Recess instead of upon two days only?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I regret to find that, owing to a misunderstanding of the new regulations, Westminster Hall was closed to the public on certain days in Easter week. I have communicated with the police authorities desiring that the public may be admitted daily throughout the year, at any hour, between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. at which Parliament is not sitting. This order will not apply to Sundays, Christmas Day, and Good Friday.

ROYAL MARINES (RESERVE).

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether their Lordships have approved of any proposal or formulated any scheme for the formation of an effective reserve of men formerly serving in the corps of Royal Marines, as stated to be under consideration in the speech of the First Lord on Naval Estimates; and if he can give the particulars to the House of such scheme?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): A scheme for a reserve of men from the corps of Royal Marines is at present being prepared by the Deputy Adjutant General. It has not yet reached a shape in which to be submitted to the Board for approval, but I think I may already say that I foresee no great difficulties in the adoption of an effective plan. Some legislation may be necessary.

LAUNDRY WORKERS.

MR. D. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a memorial recently presented to the Home Office by the Christian Social Union relating to the hours of labour and general conditions of employment of women in laundries; and, whether he will consider the desirability of introducing into any future legislation upon the subject provisions dealing with the state of facts disclosed in the memorial?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: The Secretary of State has received the memorial in question, and will certainly consider the representations made in it when the time comes for further revision of the Factory Acts.

CIVIL (UNCOVENANTED) SERVICE (INDIA).

MR. GORELL BARNES (Kent, Faversham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the Dispatch of the Government of India, dated 20th September 1893, on the leave and pension rules of the Civil (Uncovenanted) Service, published in a Return to an Address of this House, dated 11th August 1896, full consideration will be given to the dissenting Minute of Sir Alexander Miller, Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council: and whether a copy of that dissenting Minute, which is referred to at page 32 of the said Return, can be laid upon the Table of the House.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: No separate dissent was recorded by Sir Alexander Miller. His views were expressed in the third paragraph of the letter from the Government of India referred to by the hon. Member, and were fully considered at the time by the Secretary of State in Council.

CRETE.

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when further Papers on the affairs of Crete will be presented; and, to what date the next batch of Papers will come?

MR. CURZON: Further Papers on Crete, carrying the narrative of events up till the end of April, are in active course of preparation, and will be laid at the earliest possible date. I hope that this may be during the course of the next fortnight.

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS' LISTS (REVISION).

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the attention of the Postmaster General has been called to the great expense caused to political organisations in connection with the revision of lists of parliamentary voters by the amount of the registration fee charged on notices of objection sent by post, viz., 2d. in addition to 1d. postage, *i.e.* 3d. postage on each objection; whether he is aware that the registration fee on these notices was fixed at 2d. as a concession at a time when the registration fee of ordinary letters was 4d.; whether a notice of objection, if sent by post in the ordinary way, would require more than ½d. postage; and, whether, in view of the fact that the work of parliamentary registration is of a public character, he will consider the advisability of reducing the postage on objections to ½d. and the registration fee at 1d., being half the ordinary registration fee as originally intended?

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster General's attention has not previously been called to the subject referred to by the hon. Member, but he is aware that the registration fee on notices of objection was fixed at 2d. by the Parliamentary Voters Registration Act 1843, at a time when a higher registration fee was charged on ordinary letters. The work prescribed by the statute in reference to these notices is not the same as that involved in the ordinary registration of a letter, and the Postmaster General will consider whether it will be possible for the special registration fee of 2d. to be reduced. With respect to the postage as distinguished from the registration fee, notices of objection have already been admitted to the half-penny rate of postage where they conform to the authorised definition of a circular.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, (S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state on what grounds the Scotch Office declined to nominate a representative to act on the Committee of Inquiry suggested by the Local Government Board for Ireland regarding the deportation of paupers from Scotland to Ireland?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: I must ask the hon. Member for longer notice. If he will put it down for Monday, I shall endeavour to give him an answer.

LAND COMMISSION.

Mr. PATRICK M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a Land Sub-Commission sat in Manorhamilton in March and disposed of 57 cases, but that up to the present no decision has been given in any of these cases; and when will the decisions in these cases be given?

The Hon. Member also asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if he were aware that a large number of originating notices were served in the Manorhamilton district of county Leitrim so far back as November which have not yet been dealt with; can he state when these cases will be dealt with; and will he see that no unnecessary delay occurs?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The present Manorhamilton list, the hearing of which was commenced on the 9th of March last, contained all cases from that Union in which applications to fix fair rents were received prior to the 1st day of December 1896. 57 of these cases have been heard at Manorhamilton, but the lay Assistant Commissioners have not yet been able to complete the inspection of all these holdings. The inspection is being proceeded with as rapidly as is possible, and judgments will be given by the Sub-Commission in the cases referred to on the earliest possible opportunity.

INEBRIATES (REFORMATORIES).

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W).: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is his intention to introduce, during the present Session, the Bill for the establishment of reformatories for inebriates, mentioned in the Queen's Speech; and, if he does so, whether he will include in it arrangements for the reception of habitual offenders in labour settlements, as recommended in the Departmental Committee (1895) on Habitual Offenders, Vagrants, Beggars, Inebriates, and Juvenile Delinquents (Scotland), and the Report from the Departmental Committee on Prisons (1895)?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: No, Sir; I do not think that there is any probability that my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary will be able to introduce a Bill on this subject during the present Session.

Dr. FARQUHARSON asked whether, if time could not be found for the introduction of the Bill in that House, the right hon. Gentleman would arrange for its introduction in the House of Lords?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I will consult with the Home Secretary upon the point.

POOR RELIEF IRELAND (BILL).

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, after the almost unanimous vote of the Irish Members that was given on Thursday night, that the money that had been allocated to Ireland in 1896 should go to the relief of rates, it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill and the Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill, under which this money would be allocated to other purposes; and if not, whether the Government are prepared to reconsider the position taken up on Thursday night, and make provision for the reduction of agricultural local rates in Ireland on the same basis as has already taken place in England and Scotland?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I am sorry I cannot give the hon. Member an answer to-day; perhaps he will defer the Question until Thursday next.

Mr. LOUGH asked whether it would not be reasonable to postpone the Vote for the Irish Local Government Board, which was down for that evening, until the Government should have determined whether or not the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill would be proceeded with.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I do not think that the Estimates for the year are relevant to the Question of the hon. Member. I may remind him that the Vote to which he refers is put upon the Paper to-day in accordance with the desire of the Irish Members.

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. ARTHUR BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in giving effect to any of the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Royal Patriotic Fund, Her Majesty's Government will favourably consider including within the scope of the fund the case of widows of Crimean Officers who rose from the ranks?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: After inquiry I find that the Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund are of opinion that the very numerous applications, already amounting to nearly 1,000, from the necessitous widows of petty officers and non-commissioned officers of the Navy and Army who come within the scope of the Commissioners' powers as recently extended, make it impossible for them to hold out any hope that they can extend their operations to the cases of widows of commissioned officers.

SUPPLY (WAR OFFICE VOTE).

Sir A. F. ACLAND-HOOD (Somerset, Wellington): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it will be convenient to put down the War Office Vote for the first Friday in July?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I do not think it would be convenient to give a pledge so far in advance with regard to the allocation of a day for discussing this vote. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will repeat the question at a subsequent time.

MOTION.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act 1877, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Maurice Healy and Mr. Dane; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 253.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.

[EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

Class III.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum not exceeding £68,431, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Irish Land Commission."

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) drew attention to the necessity of some steps being taken with a view to keep some check on the gentlemen who were going about the country cutting down rents—[*ironical laughter*]—on no evidence whatever. Rents were being cut down in a reckless manner and on no solid ground. Almost every reduction was accompanied by a simultaneous rise of the selling value of the occupation holding. [*Ironical laughter.*] When this legislation was introduced they were told that the object which the Government had in view was to enable the occupiers of the soil to retain their holdings on conditions which would allow them to conduct their business at a profit, to live and thrive on their holdings. But time after time holdings had been brought into Court with the result that rents had been cut down, and then the tenants immediately sold their holdings to some one else, receiving a large premium for their interest. This, he maintained, defeated the object of Parliament. This premium was obviously taken out of the landlord's pocket; and if this were to go on it was obvious that Parliament was robbing the landlord of what was his property, and for which other persons were prepared to pay a substantial premium. The incoming tenant who bought the holding, and gave an enhanced price for it, had in a great majority of cases to borrow the money to pay the premium; he paid interest at the current rate, and this was a good deal more than the holders of Consols received.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was in order in discussing the policy of the Act of 1881 on this vote.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: No. I do not think it would be in order to discuss the policy, except so far as the action of the Assistant Commissioners is concerned.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER said this was what he was doing. Parliament had been under the impression that the persons who would be employed would exercise judicial functions in a judicial spirit and that the reduction of rents would be fair and reasonable. His contention, on the other hand, was that these persons had been keeping their eyes on the popularity which might attach in some quarters to the wholesale cutting down of rents, by means of which wholesale robbery had been perpetrated. An occupier 15 years ago was in a better position with regard to his annual outgoings in respect of the land than the tenant was now after two processes of wholesale reduction of rents. These gentlemen were known some years ago by the name of "sub-confiscators;" and these were the "chief confiscators," who disregarded every judicial attribute and simply endeavoured to make friends with mammon—[*laughter*]—insuring their own reappointment by making themselves popular with the class which they thought possessed the largest share of political interest. What, in these circumstances, did the Government propose to do? He thought they ought to have some data by which Parliament could decide whether or not it was the duty of the State to make recompense to those who had been robbed. He hoped the right hon. Gentlemen who represented the Irish Office would be able to assure them that the Government intended to hold an inquiry. He maintained that a great wrong had been done.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that so long as this country maintained its Free Trade policy in the extraordinary way in which it was maintained, he had no doubt that reductions of rent would continue to be given in England and in Ireland. He should like to say one word to correct the right hon. Gentleman. He was entirely in error in supposing that there was a large demand for the purchase of holdings in Ireland. Except in the case of small holdings of five or six acres, there was practically no demand. He challenged any landlord to put up for sale a farm of 100 acres with a fair rent fixed near even large cities like Dublin or Cork. He did not profess to understand Down or Antrim; but he declared for such a farm they would get nothing. Where high prices were given for small farms they were generally given by retired policemen or by men who had made a little money not out of land. ["Hear, hear!"] These high prices were given generally by fools who know nothing about land. They would make more if they put their money in the savings bank. [*Laughter.*] But he had never been able to understand the outcry as to the reductions of rent in Ireland when the Scotch rent reductions received not a word. Under the Crofters Act there was power to remit arrears, and they found the Crofters getting 50 and 60 per cent. reductions; and then on the second judicial term, as in Orkney, there was a further reduction of 17 per cent.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: But they do not sell their tenant-right.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The Scotch never had the common-law right of free sale. The great prevailing influence in Ireland was fixity of tenure. He regretted that the Land Commission had not given them a Blue-book. Every year the Scotch Crofters' Commission issued a Blue-book giving full details, and he wished the Irish Land Commission would do the same. As to the reductions made by the Sub-Commissioners it did not lie in the mouths of the Party opposite to attack these gentlemen. He had gone into the matter, and he found that, with three exceptions, every one of the existing Sub-Commissioners had been appointed by a Tory Government. As to the Head Commissioners, Mr. Murrough O'Brien was the only one appointed by a Liberal Government, and he was now never consulted under the majority rule. He never pitied any man more than he pitied the Chief Secretary, with whom rested the appointment of these 80 gentlemen. He himself had received 3,496 applications—[*loud laughter*]—therefore, he could imagine what had happened to the Chief Secretary. ["Hear, hear!"] But what had the Chief Secretary done? Out of 80 appointed three were Catholics. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Something like 76 were landlords or land agents. He did not believe that more than three of the 80 had any connection with the tenant farmers; and these were the Sub-Commissioners they complained of. The reductions were not half enough, and if Free Trade continued they would have to be increased. It was only because the Irish farmers were used to a lower rate of subsistence than the English, and because their daughters and sons gave their labour, that so many rents were paid. If the boys and girls had been paid for their work, not one-tenth of the rents which the Sub-Commissioners called fair would have been paid. Now, however, the young peopl were going to America, where they could get paid for their labour, with the result that after 60 years' reign Her Majesty would find the population of Ireland reduced to one-half of what it was when she came to the throne. It was idle for the landlords of Ireland to make an outcry against the Sub-Commissioners, almost every one of whom were of the same religion, race, and blood as the landlords, and who gave their decisions with very bad grace. What could be more extraordinary than the Prime Minister's recent allocution? Supposing that, while the Coercion Act was in greater vigour than it was now, some of the people who were suffering under its operation had come to the Prime Minister and said: "Oh, your sentences are very hard, your plank beds are even harder still, and really these removable magistrates are behaving in a most atrocious manner!" Did any one suppose that the Prime Minister would have thrown dirt on his own statute, that he would have said: "Agitate in England, address meetings in England, expose your grievances, show them how often you have been sent to prison, explain the plank bed, bring a model of the battering-ram along with you"—[*laughter*]—"and rouse the great heart of England as to your grievances"? The tenants had no men to speak for them in the House of Lords and but few men in the House of Commons. The majority in both Houses was permanently arrayed against the Irish people. The landlords had the whole of the House of Lords and about three-fourths of the House of Commons with them, and yet Lord Salisbury had advised them to go on platforms and explain their grievances. If they were to believe *The Times*—though he did not think that an organ to which they ought to attach much credence—the Government had resolved to appoint a committee of experts. A more fatal policy could not be devised. Already there was in fair rent cases the right of appeal and of a counter-appeal. Were they going to throw the whole thing into the melting pot and call up the Sub-Commissioners, the Chief Commissioners, and the Judges of Appeal, and ask them to explain the grounds upon which they had reduced Pat Doolan's rent from £10 to £8? In 1882 Mr. Justice O'Hagan and Mr. Commissioner Litton refused before a Select Committee of the House of Lords

Mr. T. M. Healy.

to state the grounds of their legal decisions, but neither of them was sent to the Clock Tower. Upon this occasion Lord Salisbury had condemned a Select Committee—who, however, could send for persons, papers, and records, and could commit for contempt—as an unsuitable tribunal for re-trying this matter. Was it then to be committed to a Royal Commission who had no power to send for witnesses, to take evidence upon oath, or to send anybody to gaol? Surely that would be a feebler tribunal than a Select Committee. And if a Royal Commission were appointed, who could be got to serve upon it? Landlords and tenants could not serve upon it, neither could Members of either House of Parliament, because they were supposed to be prejudiced from some one point of view or another. Were tinkers or tailors, who had no interest in the land question, to form the Commission, or were the Government going to bring the Scotch Crofting Commissioners down to go into the Irish land question? He had seen it stated that Mr. Clare Sewell Read and Mr. Pell should be appointed, but they could know nothing about the price of bog-land in Connaught, although they knew everything about high scientific cultivation in this country. After all, there was no good in quarrelling with the Land Commission, except from the point of view that they did not give large enough reductions. He saw no solution for the present condition of the landlords except through some system of purchase. Land in Ireland had reached the low-water mark, and very soon it would barely pay the rates, especially if the Government insisted upon not paying half the rates as they now did in England. The present reductions of rent were the slow but grudging acknowledgments which the sub-Commissioners had been obliged to make of an economic condition which had been produced, not by agitation, not by unrest, not by dishonesty—for the Irish people were amongst the best payers of rent—but by a series of laws which year after year this Parliament had been good enough to pass for Ireland.

Mr. EDWARD CARSON (Dublin University) said he did not intend to go at any great length into the Irish Land Question because he was tired of bringing it before the House and the Government. Notwithstanding what the hon. and learned Gentleman had said, his view was that the present condition of the Irish landlords was entirely the result of the fact that they had no political power whatsoever. He regretted to say that his view of the English parties was that, while they were always quite willing to take any extraneous advantage or assistance they might get from Irish landlords, or from those who sympathised with them, they were never prepared to show any sympathy with Irish landlords in return. After all, the Irish landlords had no political power which would enable the English landlords to be kept in power; and so it was that whenever they raised this question in the House of Commons they got occasionally, as they were going into the lobbies, a few encouraging words from Members on that side of the House, who said: "We heartily sympathise with you; but you know we must vote with the Government." [*Ironical Irish cheers.*] That was his experience of that House, and so far as he was concerned, whether it was the property of the Church or of the brewers that was attacked in that House, for the future he should always take what was best for Ireland in reference to any question, and solely in regard to that he should give his vote. [*Nationalist cheers.*] The truth of the matter was, he was really tired of being talked of as an Irish Conservative when it suited the English Conservatives, and of being deserted by the English Conservatives just when it suited them. [*Irish cheers.*] What was going on at the present moment in Ireland? He would give the House a few figures. He had before him an extract of the rents that were fixed in December last. The total original rents dealt with by the Commissioners were £16,826, and the valuation was £12,543. On the first statutory term it was fixed at £13,239, or a little over the valuation: but on the second statutory term what was originally £16,826 was reduced to £9,553, or about one-third less than the tenement valuation upon which the taxes were fixed, and in relation to which that House had refused any relief to Ireland. That was a specimen of what the landlords were suffering. ["Hear, hear!"] When they found that by their legislation the rents of the Irish landlords had been reduced to that extent, he unhesitatingly said that a serious condition of affairs had arisen in that country. He should like to know, if the same method of valuation went on through the various successive periods fixed by the Land Acts, what would be left to the landlords after one more valuation. [" Hear, hear ! "] It was all very well to tell him that there were also great rent reductions in England. No doubt there were, but the two cases were entirely different. In the first place, if there were reductions in England the landlord gave them voluntarily, and if he did not he got back his land. In Ireland there was no such power to get back the land. By the action of that House—and he said this as not in the least grudging the reduction the tenant had got if it was a just reduction—they had taken away an elementary right of property from the landlord. If, for the benefit of the State and of the public, they wished to give his land to somebody else at a rent which they themselves fixed, then at once, unless they were prepared to compensate him, they raised the question of having confiscated a right which he had just as much as he had in any other kind of property. [" Hear, hear ! "] That being so, he said a grave question had arisen in Ireland. And while no one knew better than he did, that in the past many tenants in Ireland had had a hard time and a hard life, and had lived upon a standard of livelihood which probably would almost be unknown to people of a similar class in this country, they must not imagine that there were not people connected with the land-owning class in Ireland who had not gone through hardships which, if not greater, were at least equal to those of the tenants. He received, day after day, letters from Ireland, which he believed would almost draw tears to the eyes of the very hardest, in connection with this question, from people tenderly and genteelly educated and brought up, who, through no fault or extravagance of their own, had been deprived absolutely of the means of subsistence. He had known of cases of men of great education and of great ambitions who had died in the garrets of London absolutely of starvation in consequence of the condition this Irish land question had come to. Therefore, if there were cases of hardships on the one side, there were also such cases on the other, and he said it was a reproach to this country and to the Union under which they lived that when, for the sake of governing Ireland, they deemed it necessary to pass these laws, they asked, as the price of the maintenance of that Union the starvation of those with whom they had been associated and with whom they sympathised. [*Irish Unionist cheers.*] Of course, he was not in a position to attack these reductions if they took the rent from an economic point of view. He could not tell whether these rents were just or not. They had set up a system which debarred them from admitting that they were just reductions, and that was his case. He had put question after question to the Chief Secretary—and he did not for a moment suppose that his right hon. friend was in the least lacking in sympathy with his view—as to what were the reasons for these reductions, and the Chief Secretary had told him that the Land Commissioners' Court were not bound to give any reason for the reductions they made. No, they gave their judgments, which they communicated by means of a halfpenny post-card to the agent, and they absolutely declined to give any reasons. He said that such a system as that was a monstrous absurdity, and it was ridiculous to talk of any such system of Courts as was set up for this purpose being regulated by the ordinary procedure which was adopted in any Court of justice, whether in this or in any other country [" Hear, hear ! "] He would tell the House why no reasons were given, and this was what, he thought, lay at the whole root of this matter. No reasons were given because the moment they departed from contract and from market value they could set up no standard except a standard of guesswork ; and when they selected a number of men and asked them to fix what was a fair rent, what were they to start from ? The truth of the matter was that the system was an absolutely impossible one, and let them not pretend, whatever might be the result, that they were voting this £127,000 for the purpose of paying these Courts as a matter of justice or as a judicial matter. Let them acknowledge the whole thing as a farce, as of course it was, and deal with it accordingly.

["Hear hear!"] It might be necessary, he did not say it would not, further to reduce rents in Ireland. It might be necessary to the peasantry of Ireland, with other people in this Empire, to adopt a higher standard of living than they had hitherto lived. If that were so, then a grave question faced the State. But let the State face the question and not be afraid of it, and let them not have, time after time, as the only one act of statesmanship towards Ireland that they ever knew of in the House, a Land Bill depriving the landlord of the last remnant of his property. A good deal was said by the hon. and learned Member for Louth about the appointment of these Sub-Commissioners. He was not going to attack the appointment of the Sub-Commissioners. He thought the applications for recommendations which came to him amounted, if not to thousands, at any rate to hundreds; but he recommended none of them, and he knew none of the gentlemen who were appointed. He was not going to attack them, for the simple reason that these gentlemen had been put in the position of having to perform an impossible task. This was the problem which confronted his right hon. Friend. He was told to find in Ireland 90 men who, without any guidance from the Act, without any standard set up, were to fix up what each one of them at his own sweet will thought a fair rent. He was not going to attack these men — it would be cowardly to do so. The thing to be attacked was the system set up by the Acts of Parliament. ["Hear, hear!"] When they were considering the claims of the Irish landlords they could not leave out of sight the large sums that were being paid every day for tenant-right. It was ridiculous that a man should have his rent reduced say £50, and immediately afterwards go into the open market and sell exactly what that £50 was worth. That was simply transferring the property from the landlord to the tenant. He would give the House an example of the method in which this operated. He saw the other day in a newspaper an advertisement offering for sale the tenant's interest in a farm. It announced Griffith's valuation—*i.e.*, the valuation for rating purposes; it announced the old rent, it announced that some 30 or 40 per cent. had been taken off by the Commission, and it invited the public to come in and bid for the value of the tenant's interest. That was not all, for there was an important postscript:—

> "N.B.—The first statutory term will shortly expire, and then the tenant will be able to again go into Court and have his rent further reduced."

There was no question of improvements arising; these had been all taken into consideration upon the first statutory term; but it was an invitation to the public to come in and compete, and one of the baits held out was that the rent would be still further reduced when the first term expired. He admitted that the high prices given for farms in Ireland arose a great deal from what might be called a land-hunger. ["Hear, hear!"] He admitted it, and it would be quite untrue to put it in any other way. But what did that mean? It meant that where, in England, a man who did not wish to stay upon his farm, could go to the manufacturing towns and get employment for himself and his children—["Hear, hear!"] But in Ireland that was not the case, the farmer must stick to the land. ["Hear, hear!"] Yes, but how was that to affect the landlord? The fact was that, by reason of the special circumstances of Ireland, land was more valuable than in England. But if, for reasons of the state, the tenants were to be prevented from paying high rents, was it fair to put the whole burden and disadvantage on the landlords? Surely not. ["Hear, hear!"] When the Land Acts were passed in 1881 they were told that the administration of them would be perfectly safe, because the House was prepared to appoint a Land Commission which would command every possible respect, by reason of the status of the three Head Commissioners. He said nothing of these three Head Commissioners personally, but he said that the whole register of appeal administered by the Commissioners was an absolute farce. What was the appeal? The Commissioners were paid some £3,000 or £3,500 a year, and what did they do? When a case for the settlement of rent went down it first came before the Sub-Commissioners, two of whom were laymen supposed to be acquainted with land and the other was a legal Commissioner.

The two Agricultural Sub-Commissioners went out and valued the land. Now what was this appeal for which the country was paying so much? What the three Commissioners simply did was this. Having received the assessment of rent made by the lay Commissioners, simply meant that two Sub-Commissioners sit in judgment upon the rent fixed by the other. [An HON. MEMBER "No, no —two."] Well, take it to be two. It simply meant that two Sub Commissioners who had heard the case, had to appeal to two Sub Commissioners who had never heard the case at all. [*Laughter.*] And then as to the appeal, what happened was this. You went into the Appeal Court and you found a Judge of the High Court presiding with all the dignity of a Judge of the Queen's Bench—Mr. Justice Bewley; they found sitting by his side Mr. Commissioner Fitzgerald, also a lawyer, originally a county court judge, who was appointed he believed by Mr. Gladstone; and they found also Mr. Wrench, who he believed was an expert in the breeding of hackney horses. [*Laughter.*] There they sat in solemn state, that was, if the three of them happened to be present, and what occurred was this. The Judge would say, "Have you read the report of the Sub-Commissioners who have valued this farm?" and if you said "Yes," he would say, "Do you think, after that, that it is necessary to hear this case?" [*Laughter.*] That was the whole procedure, day after day, with hundreds of thousands of pounds depending upon it—the whole procedure for which they were going to vote this £125,000 to-day, or at all events a considerable portion of it. He maintained, and he believed that if any one of these three judges who were drawing salaries could be got at in a confidential humour when not sitting in court, he would admit that the whole thing was absolutely ridiculous. And that was what they were asked to pay for to-day, or that the country was asked to pay for.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Their vote is from the Consolidated Fund.

MR. CARSON: No doubt, but there were the Sub-Commissioners who value, and other officials. Why, what did they do but read up the Sub-Commissioners' reports? While he said that as regarded these gentlemen, let him say again that the system they had set up was an impossible one. Nobody would deny that Mr. Justice Bewley, as a lawyer, was an absolutely competent man and a perfectly fair and upright judge; he was a man of distinguished learning, who had held very high positions before he went on the Bench. That he admitted, but it was only in an occasional case that these questions arose, and as regarded the rest of the system, what he had described to the House—ridiculous as it appeared —was absolutely what took place in the Land Court if any of these decisions were appealed against. How long then was this system to go on? Hon. Members opposite might say that he was throwing out a bait for their assistance. Well, if the House liked to say so, be it so. It was perfectly true that he should be glad to have their assistance, and he thought that a scheme might be very easily devised—that was, if this great English Government were prepared to deal with liberality——

MR. T. M. HEALY: Do you want a fresh Land Act?

MR. CARSON: A scheme might be easily devised which might confer great benefits on the tenants, and at the same time enable the landlords to find some salvation. That naturally brought him to the second question, the question of purchase. It had always been put forward by consecutive Governments that the real solution of this land question in Ireland was purchase. All he could say was that the reports which reached him of the methods in which the Purchase Acts were carried out were anything but satisfactory. The Land Commission, in dealing with purchase, whereas in reality they ought to grease the wheels, so to speak, did everything they could to clog them. [*Nationalist cheers.*] To use the phrase of the hon. and learned Member, they were always higgling about small matters. A case came under his notice the other day, where a landlord and tenant had agreed for the sale and purchase of a farm for the sum of £220, which to the tenant would have meant an immediate reduction of some 20 per cent. upon the judicial rent already fixed. But the valuers were sent down, and so accurate were they in their diagnosis of the land that they refused to advance the £220, but said they would advance £200, knocking off the £20. The landlord, rather than have the matter go off, agreed to accept the £200. What was the result? Within a fortnight the tenant sold the farm in open market for £450. So much for the judgment of the Land Commission. He mentioned the incident merely as showing this—that if they wanted purchase to really succeed—and it was under purchase that the tenant got by far the greatest benefit—they must be deliberate in the way they administered these Acts. A case happened only the other day of a collision between the two Courts—the Land Commission and the Land Judges' Court. The Land Commission had valued some farms at £5,000; and just as the thing was about to be settled the Land Judges' Court said they did not think it was worth more than £3,000. So that they had the valuers of one Court valuing an estate at nearly £6,000, and those of another valuing the same estate at half the sum. The Land Commission Court seemed to think that its sole mission was to underestimate the value of land and to subtract as much as possible from the landlords' interest. There was a case in which a tenant applied to his landlord for leave to sell his farm in open market for £500. The landlord, thinking that £500 was too much for an incoming tenant to pay, exercised his right of pre-emption. The Sub-Commissioners then went down to fix the sum which the landlord ought to give for the tenant's interest, and they fixed it at £800, or £300 more than the tenant could have obtained in open market. Did the Government suppose that the landlords and those connected with them could rest satisfied while cases of that kind occurred? There was something in *The Times* of that day about the intention of the Government to grant a Commission. If it were the fact, as he believed, that rents were being fixed without any standard, and that the Land Acts were being administered to the detriment of the landlords on all occasions, there certainly ought to be an inquiry without delay. He knew that no one became a "bore" in that House sooner than a man who appeared to have a subject upon the nerves; but he felt sure that if hon. Members only knew as much as he did of the sufferings of many of the landlord class in Ireland, and of the privations of their families, whom they could not educate in accordance with their station in life, the House would pardon him for having asked once more for justice for these people. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said that he had never heard a more crushing indictment of English rule in Ireland than the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. Of course, the standpoint of the right hon. and learned Gentleman and his friends was not the same as that of the Nationalist Members, but they seemed now to be agreed that Ireland was an oppressed and wronged country. If the landlord class were oppressed, as the right hon. Gentleman averred, so were the tenants. His right hon. and learned Friend had entered that House under the auspices of the First Lord of the Treasury. When the right hon. Gentleman was contesting the Trinity College seat, the First Lord of the Treasury gave him a character as to his experience in Irish matters. It was on July 29, 1892.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: How does the hon. Member propose to connect this with the Vote?

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that he would connect it with the Vote in a way that would be patent to the meanest understanding. [*Laughter.*] On the date which he had mentioned the First Lord of the Treasury wrote his right hon. and learned Friend a letter in which he spoke of him as being specially competent to supply information and give advice upon the legal aspects of all Irish questions, and as being well qualified by training and ability to take a prominent part in the House of Commons, and on public platforms when Irish subjects were being discussed. Those were the terms in which the First Lord of the Treasury spoke of his right hon. and learned Friend who now, after five years' experience of the House of Commons had come to the same conclusion—judging from his speech—which the Irish Members on the Opposition side of the House had come to long ago—namely, that the British Parliament was either incompetent or unwilling to do justice to the Irish people. Whilst he agreed with much that the right hon. Gentleman had said he could not subscribe to all that he had said regarding the Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners, for among the 80 officials selected by the Government there was not one who could be regarded as having any special sympathy with the tenants. Without exception all the Sub-Commissioners had been appointed by the present Government, and all the Chief Commissioners, with the one exception of Mr. Murrough O'Brien, had also been appointed by them. All the gentlemen appointed by preceding Governments had been reappointed by the present Ministry with approval of their judicial action. The landlords declared that the reductions of rent pressed hardly upon them. He believed that that was so, and sympathised with them. His right hon. Friend who spoke a few minutes ago was not singular in that respect, but the answer to his complaint was, who had produced that system? ["Hear, hear!"] The English Government had produced it—["hear, hear!"]—and he contended that the Irish landlords would be better off if they joined with their own colleagues than they were in relying on an English Government. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University had referred to the land hunger which existed in Ireland. He said that there was a land hunger because of the limited supply of land, and because there was no other outlet for industry in Ireland; but who was responsible for the fact that there were no industries in Ireland? It was the English Government. [*Cheers.*] But in the misfortunes and vicissitudes which must always accompany movements like the land agitation, the misfortunes that had fallen on the toiling millions of Ireland must not be ignored. No doubt it was very miserable to see the reductions that had to be made in the great households; but he would rather see a reduction in the establishments of 10 country gentlemen than one child in want of a bit of bread. ["Hear, hear!"] He wondered whether the Chief Secretary would maintain during this Debate his uncomfortable position of energetic silence. [*Laughter.*] The right hon. Gentleman had lately been like a sheep dumb before the shearers. Would he hear his right hon. Friend the Attorney General? He would be glad to hear him because he knew he sympathised with him. He would be also glad to know whether they were to hear anything from their Friend the hon. Member for South Tyrone: or were the Government going to "Gorst" him? [*Ministerial cries of* "Order!"] He would withdraw that expression if it was unparliamentary. He thanked the House for the kindness with which they had listened to him. He would, in conclusion, impress on his Unionist Friends that all Irishmen had much in common, and if they could only take the country into their own hands, they would soon cease to be bullied and cajoled by an incompetent English Administration. [*Cheers.*]

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): My right hon. Friend the Member for Dublin University has touched in eloquent terms on the misfortunes under which the landlord class in Ireland are suffering at this time. I do not think that from those words anybody on either side of the House will dissent. Undoubtedly the landlord class in Ireland are suffering severely. Their incomes have been very materially reduced during the last 15 or 20 years; they are in a large number of cases heavily burdened with charges on their estates; and in many instances they have been reduced to live on a comparatively small portion of the income they once enjoyed. All that is undoubtedly true. There may be some controversy as to whether these misfortunes have been brought about entirely in consequence of the legislation this House has passed from 1881 upwards; but I should not be in order in discussing the policy of the Land Act of 1881, and the amending Acts that followed it. Still, I think it is only right to remind the House that, while we on this side of the House never approved of the principle of the Act of 1881 in the first instance, yet, on the other hand, there were difficulties in connection with the Irish land question at that time which, no doubt, did call for legislation of some kind or another—["hear, hear!"]—and in the speeches that have been made lately by the landlords and those who represented them at the Convention in Dublin and elsewhere, I must say that I could have wished there had been some reference to the circumstance that the Richmond Commission and other Commissions, consisting to a very considerable extent of landlords, declared that some of the principal evils at that time arose from the excessive price then paid for tenant-right, and from the fact that rents had been too much raised on the tenants. ["Hear, hear!"] It is impossible, in taking a general view of the land legislation of the past 15 years, and in endeavouring to form an estimate as to whether it was justified or not, to leave these considerations entirely out of sight; and I would go further and remind my right hon. Friend that, although the landlords and their representatives attack the policy of the Act and the amending Acts, when those amending Acts were before the House they did not vote against them. They did not vote against the Act of 1887, nor against the Second Reading of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, nor against the Second Reading of the Bill of last year. In these circumstances I think they must admit, as we on this Bench admit and maintain, that whatever objections may be justly raised to the principle of the Act of 1881, that Act, having been once passed into law, it would be unwise and unstatesmanlike to attempt to return to the condition of things that obtained before it was passed. ["Hear, hear!"] Apart from the question of the policy of the Act of 1881, this discussion has mainly turned on the procedure and *personnel* of the Land Commission. My right hon. Friend the Member for Dublin University made a speech of very great moderation, especially when compared with the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet, who himself once held the office I now hold. My right hon. Friend the Member for Dublin University, in discussing this question of the Sub-Commissioners, admitted that he was not in a position to say whether the reductions of rent lately made by them were just or not—very different language from that held by my right hon. Friend the Member for Thanet. In this connection I should like to refer to a speech of my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Armagh, delivered in Dublin the other day. This is what he said:—

> "They passed a Land Act, and they wanted to make 40 millions spread to what 80 or 90 millions might have done that they did not get, and they chose Land Commissioners who would whittle down the rents, and then, according to this new principle of statesmanship, which he could not sympathise with, it appeared that, undoubtedly, it was more easy and more cheap to buy a bankrupt landlord than it was to buy a solvent one. So the thing was to make a bankrupt of him first and then buy him up. Now, he asked them was he exaggerating in the least?"

["Hear, hear!" from Colonel SAUNDERSON.] I am sorry to hear my hon. and gallant Friend say "Hear, hear!" because that really amounts to a charge that the Government have deliberately appointed men who might be counted upon to reduce the landlords' rents. I really do think it is unworthy of my hon. and gallant Friend to suspect for one moment that the Government in making these appointments looked to the probability that the men appointed would cut down rents. ["Hear, hear!"] If we were actuated by motives of that kind we should be unworthy of the position we occupy.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): That certainly was not my intention. I simply pointed to the fact that the Government chose Commissioners whose probable action would be to lower rents and make the landlords bankrupt.

MR. T. M. HEALY: They raised them on Lord Annesley's estate last week.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think my hon. and learned Friend's interruption very much alters what I have said. ["Hear, hear!"] We are accused on the other side of having appointed the Commissioners with the deliberate view that they should not reduce rents by an adequate amount; but I will do hon. Members opposite the justice to say that I do not think they believe that. [Mr. MACNEILL: "We do!" *and laughter.*] Of course, the object of the Government in making the appointments was to secure men who would carry out their duties in an impartial manner under the Act. Let me say one word as to the statements of the hon. and learned Member for Louth. He says that since the Government came into office 80 appointments have been made, that of these only three are Roman Catholics, and that over 70 are landlords or landlords' agents. I have not got the figures, but we have not made anything like 80 appointments. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Then you ought to!"] I think we have appointed something like 24 Sub-Commissioners who have not held the position before, and of these I believe several are Roman Catholics, though I do not know. Religion does not come into these appointments. [*A laugh.*]

I have told the Member for Louth and others more than once that it is not the object of the Government to prevent Roman Catholics from receiving appointments for which they are qualified. I think in that matter I shall have the support of the Member for Montrose. I believe that, if anything, it is the disposition of the Government to stretch a point in the appointment of Roman Catholics, everything being equal. [An HON. MEMBER: "Never; nonsense!"] I think the Member for Montrose will confirm me in that. That, however, is a matter of comparatively small importance. As to 70 out of the 80 being landlords or land agents, I am quite sure that that proportion is absolutely inaccurate.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then give us your figures and version.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The hon. Member has only to look at the published list of the Sub-Commissioners to see that his statement is without foundation.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I maintain it.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Now, Sir, I pass from that question to the complaint of my right hon. Friend the Member for Dublin University that the decisions of the Sub-Commissioners are not supported by reasons for those decisions. My answer to that is that you may analyze as much as you please and enumerate as much as you please, but ultimately you will have to come to a matter of opinion.

MR. CARSON was understood to say that he had asked to be stated the proportion of the rents to the market value.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Act of 1881 did away with it.

MR. CARSON: Might I ask my right hon. Friend whether any Sub-Commissioner has laid down what he means by a fair rent?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, the Act requires him to fix a fair rent, and he is to start from the facts as they are before him. Then there is the statement that the Commissioners are entirely in the hands of the Court valuers. It is for the Commissioners themselves to decide, after hearing the valuers, what a fair rent should be. It is a singular fallacy that, because the valuers have been Sub-Commissioners, therefore they are not to be trusted. As a matter of fact, the valuers are men who have been selected for this special duty from the body of the Sub-Commissioners at large. They are not chosen haphazard, and I do not believe you could get better valuers outside the ranks of the Sub-Commissioners. If you went outside you would have a greater chance of getting valuers who were not so impartial as the Court valuers. ["Hear, hear!"] Now I come to what is, after all, the great point. The complaint is made that these Sub-Commissioners have made reductions which are complained of as unjust and unfair. On the other side, however, it is said that the reductions are not adequate to meet the difficulties of the case. ["Hear, hear!"] There are a great many considerations which have to be borne in mind. We have heard a great deal about the high prices given for tenant-right. Then we hear about the reductions of rent being far greater than was justified by the fall in prices; and some say that the fall in rent should be according to the fall in prices. ["Hear, hear!"] It is very easy to argue from these general considerations, but I am convinced that it is exceedingly difficult from these general considerations to arrive at any clear, satisfactory, and cogent conclusion. But while the tenants appear to be dissatisfied with the rents fixed by the Sub-Commissioners, the landlords have given their dissatisfaction a practical form, for they have asked for an inquiry into the procedure and practice of the Land Commissioners. That Inquiry the Government have decided to grant. ["Oh, oh!"] The form which the inquiry will take will be a Royal Commission, small in numbers, but to be selected with a view to the impartiality of its members—[*ironical Home Rule cheers*]—and in some cases their expert knowledge of the value of land. I am not yet in a position to say what the exact terms of reference will be or who will be appointed to serve, but I have, I think, sufficiently indicated the general character of the inquiry. Whether the result of the inquiry will be to justify the expectations that are formed by my hon. Friends on this side is in my judgment very open to question indeed, but, of course, in asking for this Commission they must know perfectly well that it is possible that the conclusions arrived at by the Commission may be adverse to them.

MR. T. H. HEALY: There is no fear of that.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It is not intended that the principles of the Acts shall be inquired into; those are to be taken for granted. It will be an inquiry into the practice and procedure of the Land Commission and of the Land Courts in fixing fair rents, and into the practice and procedure of the Land Commission in making advances under the Land Purchase Acts. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Will the *personnel* of the Land Commission be inquired into?] No. The Government did not feel justified in refusing a request made so strongly by a body of men who are undoubtedly, rightly or wrongly, convinced that they are suffering very serious injustice. But there is another reason why in my judgment it is a proper thing to appoint a Commission of inquiry. Charges are now being freely made against the competence and, in some quarters, even as to the honesty, of the Sub-Commissioners. Those charges it is impossible for the Land Commissioners to meet at the present time. They have to remain silent under the accusations which are levelled against them. In my judgment, for the sake of the Land Commissioners alone, it is desirable there should be an inquiry.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Has the Land Commission been consulted?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, the Land Commission has not been consulted in the matter. Let me repeat that we have not decided to appoint this Commission of Inquiry with any preconceived idea as to whether the rents which are now being fixed are too high or too low. We feel that we have not sufficient data on which to form a judgment. We think it is very important that there should be upon this subject some kind of authoritative decision rather than that public opinion should be left to the mercy of assertions founded for the most part upon uninstructed, vague, and general considerations. [*Cheers.*]

MR. DILLON: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will inform us whether it is proposed to stop the fixing of fair rents and to suspend the payment of rents until the Royal Commission reports.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. J. MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I confess I listened to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman with considerable surprise and with some dismay—["Hear, hear!"]—and I think that the embarrassment—if I may so call it—with which the right hon. Gentleman announced the appointment of this Commission, showed that it is in no very right good will on his part that this concession has been made to the pressure of the Irish landlords. [*Cheers.*] That pressure began almost immediately after the passing of the right hon. Gentleman's Act of last year; it was pressure that was set in operation in anticipation of anything that was done by the Commissioners or by the Sub-Commissioners. When the Duke of Abercorn brought this proposal forward in another place the Prime Minister dismissed it with a series of objections which those who heard him felt were in his own mind conclusive at the time. What is taking place now is a repetition of what took place, and took place with such mischievous results, in the case of the Land Act of 1881. ["Hear, hear!"] All who sat on the Committee over which I presided in 1894 are aware that witnesses of every kind came before that Committee and gave as one of the reasons for what is an indisputable fact—namely, that the rents fixed in 1882 and 1883 were too high—the deterrent effect exercised on the minds of the Sub-Commissioners, first of all by the appointment of a Committee, and, secondly, by the attitude of Lord Salisbury and others.

MR. CARSON: I do not recollect any such evidence.

COLONEL WARING: I must say I have no recollection of it.

MR. J. MORLEY: The evidence may have been given after those hon. Gentlemen, unfortunately, deserted the Committee.

COLONEL WARING: There was no evidence taken after we left.

MR. J. MORLEY: My statement can be tested by the Blue-book. Besides, the hon. Member for South Tyrone was a Member of the Committee, and I am sure he will not deny what I have said. Now, one very extraordinary reason for the appointment of this Commission has been given; it is that Gentlemen below the gangway opposite and gentlemen in Ireland—landlords—have made extravagant and unjust and partisan accusations as to the action of the Land Commissioners. That was to say, if you want a Commission all you have to do is to make a series of extravagant and unsubstantiated charges, and the Government of the day, in order to clear the officers so charged, will appoint a commission of inquiry. The First Lord of the Treasury used to say, or, at any rate, his policy indicated the belief by him, that the Land Commissioners are judicial, or quasi- or semi-judicial gentlemen. Would he, I wonder, have consented to appoint a Commission in order to meet extravagant and unsubstantiated assertions made by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway on the Opposition side of the House? He would have been the last man in the House to do so. There is another point I must mention. The hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin might say that the Committee over which I presided did not take all the evidence which ought to have been taken—[Mr. CARSON: "Hear, hear!"]—but the Chief Secretary for Ireland brought in a Bill founded avowedly—— Oh, the right hon. Gentleman may shake his head, but it was so. It may have been bad tactics on the part of the Chief Secretary, but as to the fact there is no doubt. In introducing his Bill, the right hon. Gentleman referred again and again to the report of the Committee as constituting the foundation upon which he reared his Bill. He, at all events, appeared to think that there was so much value to be attached to the evidence taken before that Committee and to its Report that he felt legislation was called for, and not a word was said, in the introduction or the conduct of that Bill, to show that the right hon. Gentleman for one moment thought that any reason had been brought forward why the action of the Sub-Commissioners or the Land Commissioners should be subjected to unfavourable criticism. At that time, not nine months ago, it had not entered into the right hon. Gentleman's mind that there was any kind of objection made to the action or equity or fairness of the gentlemen who administered those Acts. The right hon. Gentleman said in the earlier part of his remarks what I entirely subscribe to. He said it was doing him and the Irish Government a great injustice to suppose for a moment that he has appointed one single Sub-Commissioner either because he hoped or thought that he would fix rents high or low. I do not suppose for one moment that such a consideration ever entered into the mind of the right hon. Gentleman; but is he not by appointing this Commission, because suspicions, or more than suspicions, have lodged themselves in the minds of the landlord party, showing that he is himself yielding to the expression of suspicions which, as applied to himself, he indignantly and quite properly repudiates? He says that this Commission is not to inquire into the principles of the Land Act, but into procedure only. What kind of evidence, I want to know, is this Royal Commission going to take which did not come before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1894, and what kind of men are you going to have? It has been suggested in the public prints, but I dismiss the matter from my mind as entirely unworthy of belief, that this Commission is to be presided over by a Judge, and the name of an able Judge was mentioned; because, say what you like, the object of the Commission can only be one which cannot be friendly to the tenants. [*Nationalist cheers.*] I do not say the right hon. Gentleman or the Government have in their minds a deliberate intention of any sort of putting pressure on the Land Commission or Sub-Commissioners, but it is perfectly notorious—and the Irish are not so slow-witted as not to be wide awake to the fact—that this Commission is appointed to please the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University and those whom he so ably and powerfully represents—[*Nationalist cheers*]—a Commission appointed with the expectation in the minds of those who got it appointed that they will find flaws and inequalities and errors in the procedure of the Land Court. To put a Judge at the head of a Commission which, say what you like, is to be a landlord Commission —[*Nationalist cheers*]—will certainly not be killing Home Rule with kindness. ["Hear, hear!"] I will not say any more than this. You pass a Rent Act in 1887—I do not go further back than that—and another Rent Act in 1896; and then in 1897, before the Act has been eight or nine months in operation, you show so little confidence in your own handiwork that you are going to appoint an important Royal Commission to overhaul the doings of the body to whom you have intrusted the carrying out of your legislation. I have heard the announcement with dismay and deep regret; and I am perfectly sure that the Chief Secretary, when he is in Ireland at all events, knows it is a most fatal error they are making with a view to the good working of his own Act. [*Cheers.*]

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not propose to survey the whole Debate that has taken place to-night upon the Land Commission, but one or two words, I think, must be said in answer to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. I do not traverse what I should regard as inaccuracies, however important in themselves, which are not relevant to this particular Debate—such an inaccuracy, as I think, as the statement that the Bill of last year was based on the Report of the Committee over which the right hon. Gentleman opposite presided. I do not think that is an accurate description of the Bill, which, though it did contain several of the non-controversial clauses which found a place in the right hon. Gentleman's own Bill, did not resemble that Bill in any of its broader aspects, and certainly did not copy that Bill in many of the objectionable features, as we think, which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to add to the land legislation of Ireland. The immediate discussion before the House is the propriety of the course which the Government have adopted. When the right hon. Gentleman opposite points out that we are dealing with a judicial body, and that inquiries into the action of a judicial body are in themselves rather dangerous remedies, I entirely agree with him. I think the course we have adopted is one which ought to be adopted with reluctance, and only if there is adequate ground shown for it; but observe that, by the very nature of the case, the sort of judicial work which we have thrown upon the Land Commission by the Act of 1881 and successive Acts justifies a procedure which would not be proper if we were dealing with the administration of settled principles of law such as those which the ordinary practice of the Courts in this country administer. I have never concealed from the House that, however great the excuses—and they were great—for the experiment made in 1881, that experiment was in itself a disastrous experiment—[*cheers*]—foredoomed to failure, or, at all events, to partial failure—and that we attempted to do through the medium of a Court that which no Court could adequately accomplish. Let it not be said it is no longer open to us to make in 1897 such criticisms as were passed in 1881 inasmuch as we ourselves have been responsible for Acts amending the Act of 1881. No such criticism holds good against our policy. The Act of 1881 was passed, rightly or wrongly—wrongly and unfortunately, as I think—and it became the fundamental law governing the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland, and no practical statesman, I venture to say, would suggest that the system then established could be destroyed except by the gradual extinction of double ownership by the creation of a great system of peasant proprietary. That has been our view consistently for the last 16 years. Holding that view, we have felt it our duty, not merely to pass from time to time Acts intended to facilitate land purchase in Ireland, but also, finding that we had to administer Ireland under the Act of 1881, to make the principles of that Act as tolerable as they could be made and as just to the various parties connected with land in Ireland. That is the position of the land problem as we conceive it. What has happened is precisely what everyone foresaw must happen—namely, that these Land Courts have been subjected, from one side and the other, by an inevitable necessity, to criticism which, if it has had no other effect, has had the effect necessarily of diminishing the authority with which their decisions have been received both in Ireland and in this country. It is a most unfortunate fact; it is a fact which we all deplore, but it is a fact which could have been foreseen, and which was almost inevitable, human nature being what it is. The right hon. Gentleman opposite says, "You are appointing this Commission in the interests of the landlords—[*Nationalist cheers*]—all those who represent the tenants will complain, and have a right to complain, of the course you are pursuing." The course we are pursuing is as greatly justified by the utterances of the friends of the tenants as it is by the utterances of the friends of the landlords. It is perfectly true that the landlords hold, rightly or wrongly, that the recent reductions in the second statutory term have been excessive. True it is that they have criticised in detail the machinery of the Land Commission, and in particular they have alleged that the system of appeal is one which practically gives, and can give, no confidence to the various suitors who come before the Commission. But if these have been the charges levelled by the landlords against the administration of the Acts, charges equally as strong, and uttered from even more numerous mouths, have been uttered against the Land Commission on behalf of the tenants. In this afternoon's Debate charges against the Land Commission of not reducing rents sufficiently have been explicitly made by, among others, the hon. and learned Member for Louth. I really think it would be better if no suspicion existed as to the action of the Land Court, that no charges of this kind were bandied about from side to side. We have to take facts as they are; and undoubtedly the result of recent events has been that a widespread sense of insecurity as to the decisions of the Sub-Commissioners in the first instance and of the Head Commissioners on appeal has been diffused throughout both the great classes concerned in the administration of the Land Acts. Under these circumstances are we wrong in doing what we can to restore that confidence which, through no fault of ours, has been shaken in Ireland? [*Laughter.*] I gather from the laughter of the hon. Member for Donegal that he regards with derision that statement of policy on the part of the Government. But let me say that there may be circumstances under which, whatever may be the evils of action, the evils of inaction are still greater—["Hear, hear!"]—and I am convinced that, though it is far better, if you can, to leave the action of any tribunal untouched by public criticism, uninterfered with by outside inquiry, still, if you reach a point when the result of inquiry would be to restore confidence which has been shaken and to bring back a state of things which unfortunately has been disturbed, your only choice, the only choice left open to the Government, is to take such a course and to follow it out to the best of their ability. [*Ministerial cheers.*] Now, Sir, what says the right hon. Gentleman, the Member for the Montrose Burghs? He says:—

> "Will a Commission, if appointed, add anything to the mass of information collected by the Committee of which he was Chairman?"

I am bound to say that I thought this reference of the right hon. Gentleman an unfortunate one—["hear, hear!"]—because he must be well aware that, whether through the fault of the Government, of which he was a member, or to unfortunate accident, this result was obtained—that while that Committee took all the evidence which the tenants desired on their side of the case, the landlords, however rightly or wrongly, thought that the evidence on their side of the case was burked and never taken at all. [*Ministerial cheers and cries of* "Oh!"] I believe I am not mistaken in an historical fact when I say that the Parliamentary Committee desired to close the evidence taken before it at the very moment when the principal allegations on behalf of the landlords were about to be brought before it. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Ministerial Benches*]. Even if that be not an accurate statement of fact, though I believe it to be perfectly accurate, it is universally believed by the landlords in Ireland, and that circumstance alone will show how much may still require to be done by a small Commission, and that is the intention of the Government in proposing it. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has by anticipation done his best to destroy the value of the labours of this Commission by expressing his opinion that it is appointed in the interests of the landlords. [*Irish cheers.*] Well, Sir, it can only be appointed in the interests of the landlords if the landlords have been suffering injustice. I offer no suggestion or opinion on that point at all. I can most honestly and truly say I have formed no opinion—

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then why do you appoint a Commission?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: Why appoint a Commission? I propose to appoint a Commission, as I have already endeavoured to explain to the right hon. Gentleman and to the Committee, because partly through his exertions discredit has been thrown upon the labours of the Land Courts; and some investigation of the course they are pursuing is absolutely necessary if that confidence is to be restored. For my own part I can most truly say that while I have heard a great deal both on the side of the landlord and on the side of the tenant with regard to judicial rents, I have never been able—and if I had made up my mind, if I had formed any opinion as to the action of the Commissioners in fixing judicial rents I should not express it; but I can truly say that I have formed no such opinion. On the contrary, the whole question seems to be one of extreme difficulty, and it may be naturally supposed that I have taken my share in appointing this Commission with no preformed opinion as to what the result of its labours is likely to be. I am not sure that if I had been interested in Irish land I should have pressed the Government to appoint it. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Nationalists.*] That is my own view. But we have been pressed to appoint a Commission, and even those who have not pressed us to do so—even those who like hon. Gentlemen opposite, appear to dislike the idea of a Commission—have themselves, by reiterating their unceasing criticisms upon the decisions of the Land Courts, given us the very strongest argument that can be given for the course we have adopted. Under these circumstances, Sir, I hope the Committee will feel that we really have done our best to make this almost unworkable land system in Ireland work with justice both to the landlords and to the tenants; and that if, after all the legislation in which we have been engaged, we think that an inquiry into the working of that legislation is now necessary, we say that it is necessary not because we have in any sense prejudged the controversy between landlord and tenant, but because now as ever we think it our duty to take every step which may secure justice as between those two great classes. [*Ministerial cheers.*]

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he thought there would not be in Ireland on any side of politics a second opinion as to the object with which the Commission was appointed. The object was, of course, to put pressure upon the Sub-Commissioners. This Commission had been granted at the request of the Irish landlords, he might almost say, he thought, without exaggeration, that it had been granted in consequence of the threats of the Irish landlords. Therefore, it was preposterous and absurd for the right hon. Gentleman to contend that it was a Commission in the granting of which the Government had equally considered the interests of the tenant farmers and the landlords. It was a sop thrown out to their enraged supporters in Ireland, or to supporters who affected to be enraged. Now, what was the situation? They had got a Land Commission which had been manned from the top to the bottom by a Government which was a Government of the Irish landlords. He believed, as had been already stated by the hon. Member for North Louth, and, if not admitted, not contradicted—that with the exception of one or two individuals, the whole body of Commissioners, including the members of the Head Commission, and the Assistant Commissioners, whose salaries they were now discussing, were appointees of a Government which was a Government by the choice of the Irish landlords. So that the Irish landlords were in this position—that they had had the manning of the Commission, they had had the nominating of the men who were now deciding the rents of the Irish tenants; and not content with that, they must go a step farther; and because owing to the pressure of irresistible facts and circumstances, the Commissioners were giving a certain reduction of rents—what he and his friends believed to be a very insufficient reduction—they must now insist on a Commission which could have no object but to intimidate these Sub-Commissioners with a view to producing an insufficient reduction of rents. Let him refer for a moment to the extraordinary speech delivered by Lord Salisbury in reply to the deputation of landlords. It was, he thought, one of the most extraordinary speeches ever delivered by a responsible Minister of the Crown. Because he took up this amazing position—

> "I don't profess to know whether your demand is a just demand or not, but what I advise you to do is this—if you think you have any claim, agitate;"

they were to agitate and to put pressure upon Ministers by their public agitation. Well, he and his Friends had been accustomed to be denounced in every mood as agitators, as men who were engaged in a disreputable occupation; and now they saw Her Majesty's Prime Minister advising a deputation of dukes and noblemen to allow themselves to be degraded to that same position of public agitators. [*Laughter.*] What did Lord Salisbury go on to say? He was discussing the merits of various forms of inquiry which might be granted. He first pointed out that a Royal Commission was utterly unsuited to the case. He then went on to say that—

> "there was a Committee of one of the Houses of Parliament after the passing of the Act of 1881, and my impression is that, on the whole, that Inquiry did good, if not so much as was anticipated, but on the whole it was beneficial."

Those were sinister words. Everybody who remembered that time knew that the effect of the Inquiry by the Committee of the House of Lords was an immediate cutting down of the reductions in rent—by intimidating the Sub-Commissioners; and the Prime Minister, with a masterly audacity—he might almost say indecency—deliberately pointed out to the landlords, and advocated to his Friends, the beneficial effect he expected from any Commission which might be appointed by remembering that a Committee of the House of Lords had had some beneficial effect on a former occasion, though not as much as they expected. Now what meaning could be attached to that language except one? What did the beneficial effect of a Commission upon the Irish landlords amount to? They knew that the only effect the landlords would consider beneficial would be the effect of limiting the reductions of rents by the Land Commissioners. ["Hear, hear!"] And Lord Salisbury indicated to the landlords that if they made themselves sufficiently active in agitation, and put enough pressure on the Government, no doubt their will would be carried into effect and their demands be granted. The Irish landlords, he was bound to say, did not long delay to act upon that advice. They summoned a large meeting at Dublin, which was held on the 13th of April last. He would refer for a single moment only to the character of that meeting. The character of the speeches delivered at the meeting of landlords in Dublin on April 30 removed all doubt as to the reasons for appointing this Commission. The Duke of Abercorn, at that meeting, quoted Lord Salisbury's words:—

> "In the days in which we live the class that does not complain is the class that will go to the wall,"

and he said:—

> "This means agitation. Now, agitation is a most useful method of bringing questions before the public mind. . . . . If you look back upon the history of this country you will see the every great reform has been obtained by agitation."

Here, then, they had the deplorable spectacle of a Duke advising his friends in Ireland to betake themselves to the much-abused vocation of agitators. He was astonished that the Chief Secretary had not come to the House prepared to give more particulars as to the character and antecedents of the men whom he had appointed as Commissioners.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I beg pardon. All I was unable to say was that there were so many landlords among them, so many agents, and so many tenants.

MR. DILLON thought that the right hon. Gentleman ought to have been ready to give more particulars, seeing that he must have known that the character of his appointments would be challenged. There were six members of the Chief Court of the Land Commission—because Judge Ross was practically a member—and five of them were nominees of the Unionist Government. Bearing in mind their antecedents and connections, it was impossible not to see that they must sympathise with the landlords. The right hon. and learned Member for Trinity College had drawn a very truthful picture of the farcical state of affairs in this Court when questions of land value were being considered. The Court was presided over by a most estimable Judge, who was an excellent lawyer, but who knew nothing about the value of land. Another member of the Court was Mr. Fitzgerald, who, according to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, knew nothing about land; and a third was Mr. Wrench, who was skilled in the rearing of hackney horses, and who, at one time, was one of the best known agents for the landlords in the North of Ireland. The right hon. and learned Member, however, had omitted to mention one member of the Court—namely, Mr. O'Brien. It was a very curious circumstance that Mr. O'Brien, who knew more about the value of land than, perhaps, any man in Ireland, and who was the only member of the Court appointed by a Liberal Government, was nearly always overruled. He was, in fact, almost boycotted, and the business of the Land Court was left practically to the Unionist nominees. Irish Unionists who denounced the Government ought to remember that it was the Government of their choice; they had subscribed their money to put it in power, and as long as the landlord party in Ireland helped to keep this Government in power by supporting it, they could not say with any show of reason that the appointments to the Land Commission were made in the interests of the tenants. The appointments to the Commission had not been made in the interests of the tenants. Almost to a man the officials were the enemies of the tenants. The Chief Secretary had appealed to them not to impute unworthy motives to him. He did not do so, for he did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman had appointed a single Commissioner with a view to having the rents raised. But the right hon. Gentleman had been obliged to make selections among thousands of men of whose characters, views, and dispositions he knew nothing, and what means had he to decide which of these men were fit for the appointments? Of course, he had to rely on those who recommended the selected candidates, and the officials and people with whom he was in communication had influenced him to lean towards the landlord side in making those appointments. That was inevitable, having regard to the atmosphere in which the right hon. Gentleman lived. He had himself made independent inquiries into the antecedents and character of the gentlemen who had been appointed Sub-Commissioners, and he asserted that, out of 73 lay Sub-Commissioners, 53 were, or had been in one capacity or another, closely connected with the landlord class, and he believed that many among the rest could be described in the same way. He was certain that he was well within the mark in saying that four-fifths of the lay Sub-Commissioners were either landlords, the agents of landlords—which was worse—or gentlemen who had distinguished themselves by canvassing and spouting in the Unionist cause, and denouncing the dishonesty of Irish tenants. The right hon. Gentleman had called attention to the number of farmers who, he said, had been appointed as Land Commissioners. This description of "farmer" was, however, not exhaustive in many cases. Third on the list, for example, was a gentleman who was described as "a tenant," but this gentleman had been a leading land agent and valuer for the landlords in the North of Ireland before his appointment. He had taken the greatest pains to find out the facts, and he did not believe it was possible for the Chief Secretary to contradict his statement that four-fifths of the Commissioners were either landlords or supported by the landlords in their claims to be appointed. The right hon. Gentleman was asked whether the Commission would investigate and report upon the *personnel* of the Land Commission, but they were to report upon exactly what the landlords wanted, and upon nothing else. The right hon. Member for Trinity College drew a touching picture of the sufferings, and what he described to be the feelings of despair, of the Irish landlords. He had no doubt there was a great deal of truth in that moving and heart-rending picture, but the right hon. Gentleman had touched very little on the other side, which was not the sufferings of a few individual families but of hundreds and thousands of the industrious poor in Ireland. He did not desire to inflict hardships in a spirit of vengeance upon the landlords, and still less on unfortunate bodies. Three or four years ago when the question of a Roman Catholic University for Ireland was discussed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Trinity College said that if the Irish people were only allowed to settle the question they would do so to the satisfaction of all parties. [*Cheers.*] He had thought that was the dawning of a similar view on the part of the right hon. Gentleman on the land question. In 1885, in order to inaugurate a new and happier era for Ireland, they offered terms to the Irish landlords which they would never again get—["hear, hear!"]—and those terms were thrust back and refused—[*cheers*]—as hon. Gentlemen opposite thought they could best serve the interest of their class by tying themselves to an alien Government which they believed would be loyal to the Unionist garrison. They were now reaping the harvest of what they had sown, and perhaps the time would come yet when they would find their countrymen willing, and only too willing, to bury in oblivion the bitter and miserable past, and that they would obtain better terms from them than from any English Government. [*Cheers.*] He confessed he listened with great pleasure to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Trinity College adopting their views that night, and pointing out the causes which had brought about the rackrenting and misery of the tenants in Ireland. ["Hear, hear!"] It was due, he said, to the lack of other occupations; and why was it that the people were driven to compete with each other to the point of absolute starvation and nakedness? It was because the class to which the right hon. Gentleman belonged had in the past forgotten their duties to their people. [*Cheers.*] He hoped the speech they had listened to that night was some indication of the dawning of a better day amongst the Irish Unionists [*Cheers.*] But with reference to the appointment of this Commission by which Ireland would be thrown into turmoil, and they would be afforded the spectacle of noble Dukes engaged in agitation—that was a game two could play at, and he had no doubt that the Chief Secretary by this Commission would let loose a considerable flood of agitation in Ireland. The Commission would be regarded by the tenant farmers of Ireland as a deliberate attempt to intimidate the Land Commissioners. Probably the first effect of the appointment of the Commission would be to lessen the reductions. That was the intention.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: We have stated in explicit terms that this Commission is not appointed because we have any opinion as to the justice or injustice of the decisions.

MR. DILLON: Then it comes to this, that any body of men in Ireland have only to make spurious charges against a court of law, and instantly they are to have a Royal Commission. [*Irish cheers.*] There was no pretence or excuse for this inquiry; on the contrary, the Leader of the House and the Chief Secretary had been very cautious in their language, suggesting that it was most undesirable. However, as the landlords had kicked up a row the right hon. Gentleman intimated that they had no choice in the matter. Were they going to allow the levying and the payment of rent when nobody knew what might be the result of this Commission? They were entitled to recall the remarks of Ministers last year about the finality of their land legislation. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Who said that?"] It was declared on the other side that there was to be no more land legislation so long as this Parliament sat.

MR. CARSON: Who believed it?

MR. DILLON said that he did not believe it, but Ministers said it, and they had a right to enjoy the speedy fulfilment of their promises. He should conclude by strongly advising the tenants to put into practice, with the least possible delay, the advice which Lord Salisbury gave to the landlords—["Hear, hear!"]—namely, that "in these days" classes which did not agitate would go to the wall, and he would further remind the tenants that, so far as that House went, they had nothing to expect, according to the declarations of two Ministers, from this Commission beyond an attempt to destroy the Act of 1881. [*Cheers.*]

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said, if anyone required proof as to the capacity of the Land Commissioners exercising a just decision in the matter of rent, he thought the proof came from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, and the hon. Member who had just sat down. Both of these Gentlemen said that the result of appointing a Commission of Inquiry would be to influence the Sub-Commissioners in fixing rents in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, on a former occasion, pointed out that the Sub-Commissioners were so affected in Ireland by the appointment of a Commission, that they gave unfair decisions. Now if the appointment of a Commission had this effect upon the minds of the Sub-Commissioners in Ireland, was there not good reason why the landlords, who suffered from their unfair decisions, should have some qualms? He occupied on this question a peculiar position. He was one of the few landlords who supported the passing of the Land Bill of '70, which was the foundation of all subsequent Land Acts. He never could see then, nor did he believe anyone could at that time, nor in 1881, that the passing of a Land Act meant, not fixing fair rents, but sweeping away the whole landlord class in Ireland. ["Hear, hear!"] If Mr. Gladstone had got up and said that the Act of 1881 was not an Act for fixing fair rents, but for simply lowering rents, no one on that side of the House would have been found to support it. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member then quoted from the Return showing that so far as, for example, Downpatrick was concerned, the reductions in the rent were out of all proportion to previous reductions, and the reductions in the price of produce. In fact rent was reduced now, when the price of produce was going up, and when it was higher than it was during previous periods of reductions. The reductions of 1887-8-9 had changed from 11 per cent. to 31 per cent. [An hon. Member "Quite right!"] Some rents which were reduced a few years ago by 5 per cent. were now reduced by 28 per cent.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Is the hon. and gallant Member aware that the rents in 1881, 1882, and 1883 were fixed on a wrong principle?

Colonel SAUNDERSON: That I think proves the justice of our demands for inquiry. The Act of 1881 required the Commissioners to fix a fair rent, but finding inspection too laborious a task, they went by the rule of thumb. He would mention one case which illustrated the sort of way in which rents were reduced in Ireland. Some seven years ago the rent of a farm on Mr. Trollope's estates was to be fixed. Concerning the case, the gentleman wrote:—

> "Some years ago the County Court Judge was applied to to fix a fair rent, and as the case was small, I allowed it to remain in the County Court. A few days previous to the day of hearing, at Phillipstown Quarter Sessions, I happened to be on the estate with Mr. Lennan making a valuation, and as we were going home in the evening—a very wet evening—we met the County Court valuer, blind drunk and staggering along, about a mile from the farm he was going to value. He was then too drunk to go any further, and we got him up upon a car, and sent him home. The following Saturday, when the case was called at Phillipstown, County Court Judge Fitzgerald, now Commissioner Fitzgerald, read a letter from the County Court valuer saying he could not value the farm, as it was all under water. I pointed out to the County Court Judge this was a mistake, as the farm was on the top of a hill. The result was, the case was adjourned till the following Tuesday, and the Judge said he would direct his valuer to value the farm on Monday, so as to be ready to fix the rent on Tuesday. I directed my bailiff to wait on Monday to see the valuer valued the proper farm. As I was on my way to Claremorris I met him, and he reported that the Court valuer had not been on the land. You may imagine my surprise on hearing this valuer read out in open Court a most minute valuation of this farm he had never seen, and was never within a mile of in his life except once, and was then so drunk that he could not walk. And yet the County Court Judge fixed the rent of the farm, and reduced our rent on the valuation made by this drunken man, who had never seen the farm in his life."

Mr. T. M. HEALY: That is 10 years ago. How is it we have not heard of it before?

Colonel SAUNDERSON said it was seven years ago; the Statute of Limitation had not quite run out yet. He did not say that all valuers were drunkards—far from it. He did not accuse the Commissioners of dishonesty, but he maintained they were acting on some principle with which he was not acquainted, but wanted to be. There was a revolution proceeding in Ireland. If such a state of things existed in Armenia hon. Members opposite would be found asking questions and moving the Adjournment of the House, pointing out the monstrous iniquity of things, and demanding the instant interference of the British Government. But Irish landlords might be plundered, and they sat still. The Irish landlords were called the English garrison, and they were proud to be known by that title. The hon. Member for East Mayo said, "Are you not sorry you refused what we offered you?" In the name of the class he belonged to, he said "No," and if the offer were made to them again they would refuse it. They believed that their loyalty was worth more than a few years' purchase. Bad as their position was now, he did not believe it would be improved if Home Rule were established; indeed the hon. Member for East Mayo had said with Home Rule they would make short work of the Irish landlords. The work now was not short; it went on in jumps of 15 years, but one thing was certain, that if the rents in Ireland were dealt with in the future as they had been dealt with in the past, a man would not have to live to a very great age to see the whole class of landlords swept away. He regretted the speech he made in Dublin. If he did say, as he possibly did, that the right hon. Gentleman was actuated by sinister motives towards Irish landlords he withdrew his words, though they would apply to the policy the right hon. Gentleman's Government pursued. He could not believe that the prosperity, peace and tranquillity of Ireland was to be founded upon an act of gross injustice. If they destroyed his right to property, what right would the men who came in to-morrow have to his? He believed that the outcome of the new Inquiry would be that the minds of the people would be opened to what the meaning of property and the rights of property were. If it were decided that, for State purposes, the landlord class should be swept away, he trusted the Government would, as honest men, see that the process was not accomplished at the expense of the landlords themselves.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that the case which the hon. and gallant Member had just mentioned must have occurred in 1887. [Colonel SAUNDERSON; "In 1888!"] The landlord apparently allowed the rent to be fixed without cross-examining the valuer, or without appeal. [Colonel SAUNDERSON: "Do they ever cross-examine the valuer?"] Why did not the landlord complain in Court of the state of the facts? If the valuer got drunk was that not as bad for the tenant as for the landlord? What was the name of the valuer? He presumed if they insisted upon hearing his name they would be told he was dead. Now, he had a few questions to ask in respect to the very grave statement they had just heard from the Chief Secretary. He believed that the proper way to have met that statement was by moving to report Progress, because he conceived that they ought not to go on with the Debate upon the Land Commission Vote until they knew the terms of reference to the new Commission and until they knew who were to form the Commission. He desired to know now, however, whether it was intended that past or only future rents should be affected. Of one thing this House had a horror, and that was of touching anything which was *sub judice.* But the whole rental of Ireland was *sub judice* at this moment. This question of rent was at the bottom not only of English rule but of justice, and if this Commission found the rents were too high they would have had an admission that for 15 years they had been converting tenants into caretakers, and making present tenancies into future tenancies on a basis of injustice. Since 1887 they had converted 40,000 present tenancies into future tenancies by way of evictions. Were these 40,000 cases to be inquired into by the Commission, and were they going to ask upon what principles the fair rents were decided, which afterwards led to 40,000 evictions, or were those cases to go un-discussed and un-ransacked, and what the Commission was to go on were to be the cases of the future? And if they were going to deal with future rents, did not they arrest the stream of applications, and did not they paralyse the very fountain of justice itself? He would tell the Committee the genesis of this Royal Commission. The Lord Lieutenant, the representative of Her Majesty, called on the Land Commission last week for a return of the per centage of judicial rents, and horror was expressed by him at the result of the figures. That return was presented to the Cabinet this week —and it was upon the return, irregularly obtained by the Viceroy from a judicial body and irregularly presented by the representative of the Queen, to the Cabinet, that this Royal Commission had been granted. He knew it would be said that it was granted because he had stated earlier in the evening, that the tenants were dissatisfied with the reductions they were getting, but the real genesis of the Commissioners was that which he had just stated. What was the position of these unfortunate Sub-Commissioners? There were 73 laymen, and only 30 of them had permanent jobs. The other 43 held their office till next December, and these 43 trembling wretches were to fix rents in Munster, Leinster, and Connaught with a Judge of the High Court watching their operations. Who was that Judge to be? He could not be an Englishman, because the Party opposite had denounced Mr. Justice Mathew, and had declared that it was an irregularity and an impropriety for an English Judge to go over to

Ireland, even on a mission of appeasement, to inquire into the thorny subject of evictions in Ireland. Consequently it could not be an English Judge. It could not be an Irish Judge, because every Irish Judge who had sat on the Bench had denounced their Land Acts. If it was not an Irish Judge, who was it going to be?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: It will not be either an English or an Irish Judge.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then it must be a Scotch Judge.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, nor a Scotch Judge.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then who is it?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. and learned Gentleman, but it was, I think, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose who said it was to be an English Judge. I would only say that the right hon. Gentleman has not been taken into the confidence of Her Majesty's Government in this matter.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the House of Commons had a right to be taken into the confidence of the Government—[*cheers*]—and the Government had no right to make this statement until they were prepared with the names of the Commissioners and the terms of reference. This was the 14th of May, and tomorrow the notice of this Royal Commission would go tingling to the veins of every temporary Sub-Commissioner in Ireland. To-morrow rent reductions would drop to zero. Let any man reckon the percentages that had been given up to the 15th of May, and then let him compare the percentages of reductions that would be given afterwards, and he would venture to say he would discover that reductions would fall 15 per cent. from this day forward. It was four months since the Government announced that they would appoint a Royal Commission to reverse the findings of another Royal Commission with which they were dissatisfied, and Her Majesty's Government had not yet been able to make up their minds as to who were the gentlemen who were to upset the verdict of Lord Farrer, Lord Welby, and other Treasury experts. They were now to have another period of incubation. The Government were wallowing in the mire of landlordism. Their Cabinet was a landlord Cabinet; their Executive was a landlord Executive. They were available to every landlord influence. He did not say they were not striving to do their best. He had always maintained that the Chief Secretary for Ireland was, according to his belief and his lights, honestly endeavouring, as he believed, to steer an even keel as between both parties, but he was plunged into a morass of landlordism, and if it had taken four months to get, and they had not yet got, a Commission for a subject upon which the Treasury had all the facts, how long would it take to get a sufficient number of impartial experts to inquire into the fairness of the fair rents on 350,000 Irish holdings? An instant declaration should be made on the point of what were the rents that were to be inquired into—past rents or future rents. They would, at all events, do something to prevent that feeling of consternation and alarm which would spread throughout every province in Ireland if they were to announce that it would only be as to rent fixed up to this date. Let the Sub-Commissioners, the Chief Commissioners, the landlords, and the tenants know that it would only be as to transactions decided and closed that this inquiry would take place. He could conceive no Court so destitute of self-respect as to go on fixing rents upon holdings when every act they did would be watched by jealous eyes, and when every investigation they made would be subsequently challenged, not in a court of law or of justice, but before a tribunal which had not even the power to call witnesses or administer an oath. The tenants boycotted the Bessborough Commission, and he presumed they would refuse to give evidence before the forthcoming Royal Commission. They would therefore be at the mercy of the landlords, who would be bringing forward their unsifted grievances of seven years ago—or they would have what Mr. Morley's Select Committee had in 1894, they would have to depend, as he depended, upon evidence of officials. If they had official witnesses, it would be only the Land Commissioners white-washing themselves, for it would not be presumed that they would come forward to give themselves a bad character. It appeared to him, therefore, that this proposal had every possible vice. It assailed the very foundations of law; it was an attack upon order. They were told that the British Government was a continuity. It was no longer a continuity; for while a series of statutes had been passed—one by the Liberals, five by the Party now in office, the Government of law and order now propose to indict, not only the framers of the statute, but their administrators. He had intended to say only one word more. He would give the House an instance of what went on, so as to show how far there was any prejudice in the tenants' favour in the action of the Land Courts. An hon. and gallant Member had given them the case of the Jolly estate ten years ago. He would give them the case of the Copeley estate, in the county of Wexford, two months ago. The Copeley estate was an estate under Judge Wallis's Court. The Receiver was instructed to resist the fixing of fair rents on the estate, and there was a standard rule in the Land Judges' Court not to allow any fair rents to be fixed by a County Court Judge, and to transfer them to the Sub-Commission, so that the permanent judges of the land had not the confidence, apparently, of the land judges. The Copeley tenants went into Court, and three Sub-Commissioners were sent down to hear their cases. They gave reductions varying he thought, from about 30 to 40 per cent., he spoke under correction as to the amount. The landlord appealed. What happened? Every man of the Sub-Commissioners was removed from the county of Wexford, and the two lay men were sent to the Botany Bay of the Land Commission, Belmullet in the county of Mayo. Both these Sub-Commissioners, Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Kelly, were men of the greatest moderation. Mr. O'Kelly he knew to be a landlord of the county of Roscommon and Mr. Dillon, he was told, was from the same place, and he presumed was a landlord also. What happened when these two gentlemen had given their decisions; the Land Commissioners sent down one man to review them—the weakest man, the most landlord man they could get, and he raised the rents from 10 to 15 per cent., and at the present moment there was only one of the Sub-Commissioners operating in Wexford, the other two having for their sins been chased to county Mayo [*Laughter.*] Now was that the way to treat judicial gentlemen? One would suppose that men who had gained knowledge of a county would be allowed to remain in it. These were not allowed to remain, and simply because of their decisions in the Copeley estate cases they were sent 200 miles off to the most inhospitable and the most unpleasant part of Ireland the Commissioners could exile them to. The Chief Commissioners who managed all these things were both members of the Kildare Street Club—a club consisting of landlords and land agents. So that it was by Kildare Street they were governed, and not as they thought, by the Castle. There was not a land case that was settled in Ireland that was not discussed in that club. And what was more, he said that remonstrances issuing from it—and sometimes personally—were made to the judicial members who belonged to the club. It was monstrous that judicial officers should belong to this Kildare Street Club. Would they be allowed to be members of the National League? [*Nationalist cheers.*] And if not, why should they be allowed to belong to the chief landlord organisation in the country? When they heard appeals made by a skilful advocate, no doubt great sympathy was aroused for poor ladies who had lost a margin of rent. But what about the poor widow of the Irish tenant? [*Nationalist cheers.*] What about the two millions who had perished under their eyes of famine? Did it draw tears from that House? [*Cheers.*] Since 1887 forty thousand present tenancies had been converted into future tenancies. Was there any weeping and wailing over that? Let them go down to Queenstown Quay if they wanted to have their hearts wrung by the sight of miserable people going off from the land which denied them food and shelter. And they were asked to weep over the sufferings of gentlemen who were distressed because they could not have a little more to spend at Monte Carlo. [*Nationalist cheers.*] As to the religion of the Commissioners, he had gone over their names and he could state accurately what the result was by their place of education. As far as he could make out, out of the 73 men there were only ten Catholics. About one-half of these were appointed by previous Governments;

but as far as he could make out the appointments of the right hon. Gentleman he could give him just half-a-dozen Catholics and no more.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that of course there was no official information, but he understood that among those appointed before he took office there were six Roman Catholics, and of the 19 new men appointed by himself five were Roman Catholics.

MR. T. M. HEALY: It came to this, that in a population which was mainly Catholic they were dealing with a matter that went to the very lives of the people by a body of which four-fifths were Protestants. What was it that gave a Protestant a knowledge of land? Was it a belief in the Thirty-Nine Articles? [*Loud laughter.*] Did a man's belief in the infallibility of the Pope render him incapable of judging the value of land? [*Laughter.*] They were told there were no more Catholics appointed because there were no Catholics suitable. They were not educated enough; and yet they were denied the advantages of university education. They could not have superior education because they were Catholics; and because they were Catholics they could not be Land Commissioners. And here was a fresh Commission to be appointed. Would there be any Catholics on it? Would it be three-fourths Protestant too? He was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman cared no more about religion than himself. [*Laughter.*] He meant to say he did not mind the creed of any man. But how did it come about that whenever he had to make appointments, three-fourths of them always belonged to the religion of the ascendant Party? If men were appointed who were drawn from a particular class, he maintained that they would sympathise with the people of their own religion. The proof was to be found in this fact—that the Protestant tenant farmers of the north had received larger abatements than the Papists of the south. It was a remarkable fact that the First Lord of the Treasury warned the landlords not to be too hopeful as to the result of this Commission. Did this circumstance not show that the Government themselves had no faith in their own specific, that they regarded it with anxiety, and that they were undermining the foundations of law and order? In this business there was really no foothold for the foot of common sense, and he believed that the Government had taken a fatal course. They had spread uneasiness and dismay from one corner of Ireland to the other, and if the Land Commissioners had any self-respect they would decline to go on fixing rents until this attack upon them had in some way been settled. It was amazing that the Chief Secretary should have stated that the Land Commission ought to welcome this new Commission, when he had neither consulted them as to the matter, the mode, nor the principle of its appointment.

After the usual interval MR. GRANT LAWSON took the Chair.

MR. J. C. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that the announcement made by Her Majesty's Government would be received with the greatest dismay all over Ireland. They could not forget the effect of the action of the House of Lords in 1882 and 1883, when a Committee was appointed by them nominally to inquire into the working of the Land Act, but really to overawe the Commissioners in the task of fixing fair rents. That action was responsible for much of the dissatisfaction and trouble which had since been experienced in Ireland. The second statutory term had just begun to run. In January 72 cases were heard all over Ireland, 63 being in Ulster. The aggregate rent in those cases was £1,430, and the Sub-Commissioners had reduced it for the second statutory term to £1,038. The landlords had taken alarm at this; they had held meetings; they had sent deputations to the Prime Minister with the result that the Government had that night made a startling announcement; but he was confident that when all was said and done, the landlords who had set this matter in motion would not be the most pleased. The Nationalist Members had listened with great interest and not without sympathy to the speech of the right hon. Member for Dublin University. He was surprised it did not strike the right hon. Gentleman that his speech was an indictment of the inevitable. The right hon. Gentleman might as well have tried to indict the Free Trade policy of the country, or foreign competition—nay, he might as well have indicted the unfavourable climatic conditions of the country. The Nationalist Members had much sympathy for the landlords. No one could view with equanimity the spectacle of a class—no matter who they were —reduced to straitened circumstances. But they must not think alone of the landlords. The three millions of the Irish people who were engaged in agriculture were also entitled to the consideration of the House. He asserted that if there had been no land legislation whatever, the fall in prices, the increased foreign competition, the unfavourable climatic conditions of Ireland would have justified far larger reductions in rents than the reductions which had been given in Ireland after a long and sometimes bloody agrarian struggle. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to forget that there were piles of Blue-books and carefully prepared statistics which showed that after all that had happened in Ireland the average reduction in rent up to last year did not exceed 21·5 per cent. all over the country. Much had been made on either side of the high prices which had been given for tenant-right in Ireland. But he was inclined to think that in many cases auctioneers and brokers, to show what clever men they were, quoted the prices at larger figures than had actually been realised by the tenants. It was to be observed that the landlords were very reticent in regard to those cases of sales of tenant-right. The counties were mentioned, but not the names of the parties or any other particulars. He asserted that the average price paid at the present moment for farms did not exceed eight years' purchase of the tenant-right. Mr. Justice Madden, a former Attorney General for Ireland, had declared that the tenant had at least half the property in a holding; and, therefore, eight years' purchase was not an extravagant figure for the tenant-right. It must be remembered also that that right included not only the possession of the land, but the buildings—the dwelling-house and out-offices — which were entirely the property of the tenants in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. They were face to face with the fact that owing to the scarcity of manufactures, agriculture was the great industry of Ireland, and two-thirds of the people depended upon it; and what they had to consider was—were the people of Ireland to be maintained in something like decent comfort on the soil of Ireland, or was the pauperism of the country to continue growing, or the stream of emigration from the country to go on for all time? It would be remembered that in the discussion on the Land Acts last year the representatives of the tenant farmers—not the agitators alone but the Ulster Members—asserted that the judicial rents were not fairly fixed. The question of improvements was not defined with sufficient clearness, and the question of how to arrive at a fair value, taking into account the tenant's interest, was not properly described. The Act of last year might practically never have been placed on the statute book. They had implored the Government to shorten the judicial term in order that tenant farmers with rack rents might be able to come into Court and have their cases heard. The pressure which had been brought to bear on the Government was of a patent and obvious character. The great danger was that it would be impossible for the Sub-Commissioners to consider the fixing of a fair rent with unprejudiced and fearless minds. The tenants were coming to the Court very quickly, and would be coming more and more rapidly. In 1891 they had protested against the salaries and expenses of the Land Commission being put on the Consolidated Fund. It was then argued that the functions of the Commission were of a judicial character, and that they should be put in as independent a position as the Judges of the Superior Court. They on that side did not acquiesce in that argument at that time, although there was much in it. But the Courts of the Sub-Commissioners were retained on these Votes, and it must be remembered that these men were only employed temporarily. As representing the tenant farmers of the country and the working population, who, more than any landlords, Dukes, or noble Lords constituted the people of Ireland, the Nationalist Members protested against the appointment of this Royal Commission as an act of cowardice on the part of the Government. The Government had hearkened to the clamour of a few noble Dukes and Lords, but the proposal would be received throughout Ireland with dismay and indignation. He felt that they should do something to mark their sense of the conduct of the Government, and he therefore moved "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) supported the Motion. He thought the action of the Government in this matter, having regard to the pledges which they gave to their constituents at the General Election, put them in a very tight place. He presumed they would not hear anything from the hon. Member for South Tyrone on this subject, although they would be very glad to hear whether he approved of this change of front on the part of the Government. The hon. Member, having claimed in interviews given to the Press that the Act of last year was mainly passed through his pressure, as a final settlement of the land question, had within ten months of that apparently consented to the appointment of a Commission which undermined not only the Act of last year, but every principle contained in the previous legislation on this question.

*The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Grant Lawson) requested the hon. Member to keep to the exact Motion before the Committee.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL said the statement which had been made would certainly, he thought, create the most intense dissatisfaction throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. The people had been endeavouring to give the Government the fair trial which was asked for by the Chief Secretary when he came into office. The right hon. Gentleman could not complain of there having been any very vigorous agitation in Ireland, although, for his part, he very much regretted that there had not been one—[*Irish cheers*]—as the action of the Government showed them that the only way in which they could get attention paid to their wants was by maintaining a vigorous agitation. This matter affected the whole of the people of Ireland, because their main industry was agriculture. He hoped the people of Ireland would show the right hon. Gentleman that he had over-estimated the power of his Government.

Mr. DAVID SHEEHY (Galway, S.) said the Committee were asked to pay Commissioners whose work might be knocked to pieces by the proposed Royal Commission. The money would, under such circumstances, be wasted. He hoped Progress would be reported that they might know where they were. He suggested that the Vote should be withdrawn and payment of the Commissioners suspended until after the Commissioners had reported. It was indefinite as to who the Commissioners would be, and what they were to inquire into.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said the Government could not consent to Progress being reported or treat the Motion seriously.

Mr. DILLON appealed to the Government to postpone the Vote until the Royal Commission had reported. It was only a reasonable request that the Vote should be withdrawn for the present until they knew what the terms of the reference to the new Royal Commission were to be and they knew something of the *personnel* of the Royal Commission. [*Nationalist cheers.*] The Government were about to take a far-reaching and momentous step. If the Vote were taken that night they would have no further opportunity during the Session of discussing the administration of the Land Commission. Irish Members should have an opportunity of consulting their constituents and the public opinion of Ireland as to the *personnel* of the Commission. The whole situation had been revolutionised by the announcement of the Government. He hoped the Vote would be withdrawn and put down at a later date as soon as the Government had given some information as to the terms of reference and the composition of the Land Commission, and then the Land Commission Vote might be discussed in the light of the new situation.

Sir THOMAS LEA (Londonderry, S.) said he was not prepared to vote for the Motion, but there was a good deal to be said for it. ["Hear, hear!"] The Committee had been taken rather by surprise. If on a future evening the general principle could be discussed on the Vote an acrimonious discussion that night might be averted.

Mr. M. HEALY said the Nationalist Members had come wholly unprepared for the announcement of the Government, and it was only fair that they should have time to consider it.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR reminded the hon. Member that only a limited number of nights could be devoted to Supply. If the hon. Gentleman was unable to continue the discussion that night he would point out to him that there would be another opportunity for discussing the appointment of the Commission on the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary. The hon. Member should reserve his remarks for that occasion, and not stand in the way of hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House who desired to continue the Debate. Since he addressed the Committee only one Member on the Government side had spoken, although four or five were anxious to make some observations.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 119.—(Division List, No. 209).

MR J. A. RENTOUL (Down, E.) observed that the Debate had been devoted to two branches—one being an attack upon the *personnel* of the Land Commission in Ireland, and the other an attack upon the new Commission that was to be appointed. There appeared to be a perfect unanimity between Nationalists opposite and Irish landlords on the Government side of the House with regard to the attack on the recent appointments to the Land Commission; but when they came to the new Commission the action of the Government was defended by hon. Members on their own side and attacked by Nationalist Members on the other. With regard to the appointments that had been made to the Land Commission by the present Chief Secretary, he did not join either with the Nationalists on the other side or the landlords on his own side in their attacks on those appointments, and he was bound to say that no selections by a Government Department had given him so much confidence in the manner in which public appointments were made. There was, he knew, a very prevalent notion that in connection with public appointments "Kissing goes by favour," and that a great number of appointments were made on personal grounds. It had been suggested that evening that the fact that the Chief Secretary was not personally acquainted with the candidates for the Land Commission was a proof of his unfitness to make the appointments. In his opinion that fact constituted the right hon. Member's fitness for the task. His fitness to discharge it lay in the fact that he was not personally acquainted with the candidates. One official only, namely, the Lord Chancellor, was always supposed to appoint officials on his own personal knowledge of their qualifications, while, with that exception, the theory was that the head of a Department ought to appoint on information brought before him, just as a judge and jury were supposed to give their decisions, not in matters within their own knowledge, but upon the evidence adduced in Court. The Home Secretary, for example, who appointed the Metropolitan magistrates did not claim to have any personal knowledge of fitness of candidates, but made appointments upon information supplied to him, and it was the general opinion of the legal profession that no better legal appointments were made. Then the Chief Secretary, not being an Irishman and not having lived in Ireland, had manifestly to make his appointments upon testimony laid before him. Having been anxious himself to secure the appointment of certain candidates for the position of Assistant Sub-Commissioner he had tried to find out how he could effect his object, and upon inquiry in various quarters closely connected with the Government he discovered that these appointments were to be made absolutely impartially upon testimony laid before the Chief Secretary—[A NATIONALIST MEMBER: "By whom?"]—and that no personal influence of any sort was to be allowed to bias his decision. At least 20 gentlemen went to him asking for his influence in their favour as candidates and he replied to every one of them, saying that neither his recommendation nor that of anyone else would be of the slightest value, except as one testimonial among others. Merit alone, he told them, would, he believed, be the test of any candidate's fitness. The testimonials of a large number of the candidates had come under his own notice, and he found that every one of those candidates had strong testimonials from landlords. How then the landlords could attack the appointments he did not understand. He challenged hon. Members to point to a single candidate who had no support from the landlords. [*Nationalist cheers.*] But, on the other hand, all the testimonials which he saw also contained recommendations from tenant farmers and even Roman Catholic Nationalist farmers, and from parish priests or Catholic curates. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: "How did you come to see these testimonials?"] Several candidates who asked for his support sent him the testimonials of other gentlemen in order that he might see how superior the qualifications of his correspondents were to those of their rivals. [*Laughter.*] He judged from what he knew of the testimonials of these gentlemen that were before the Chief Secretary. Every single bundle of them contained testimony from both sides. The hon. Member for East Mayo was less fortunate in his illustrations than in his eloquence; in fact, we might generally assume that the hon. Member was wrong in his illustrations, though by accident he was sometimes right. The hon. Member mentioned two gentlemen only, one of whom was Mr. Bassett. Curiously enough, that gentleman was backed by a large number of tenant farmers, and Nationalist tenant farmers, too. That gentleman's testimonials also contained one from the Roman Catholic clergyman of Downpatrick, one from a clergyman of the Irish Church, and one from a minister of the Presbyterian Church. It was true that the bundle also contained some testimonials from landlords, but a more impartial and a stronger set of testimonials was never produced before a Chief Secretary. That was one of the illustrations of the hon. Member for East Mayo, and if the hon. Gentleman had given more he might have been able to deal with them in the same way. Was it to be assumed, was it credible that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be so foolish as to appoint men to please this Member or that, or this landlord or that, and so barter away his own reputation as Chief Secretary and as a statesman? He knew Lord Spencer took the greatest care in interviewing each candidate when he was appointing Sub-Commissioners. And what did the present Chief Secretary do? A number of Lord Spencer's Land Commissioners had ceased to be in office because they were no longer required, and so were set aside, and he found that the present Chief Secretary re-appointed all of them, with, he believed, one exception; so that as far as 25 out of his 42 appointments were concerned, he appointed men who had been appointed by the previous Government. ["Hear, hear!"] So much for the appointment of those Commissioners by the Chief Secretary. As far as he was acquainted with them he was entirely satisfied with them. He spoke as the representative of a tenant farmer constituency, and his opinion was that the Commissioners had been remarkably well appointed. Speaking on behalf of his constituency, he might say that he was entirely satisfied with them, and he believed his constituents were entirely satisfied with him. ["Hear, hear!"] He therefore said that in his opinion the charges that had been made against the Land Commissioners in the past had not been well made. No man had a right to interfere with the freedom of contract between landlord and tenant, that was the position taken up by the landlords. A tenant should be allowed to pay what rent he pleased. That was the honest, downright truth—that the whole of the land legislation since 1881 was a wrong and an injustice of the strongest possible character. That was their position, but no impartial outsider could say that some legislation was not necessary in the matter of the vexed question of landlord and tenant in Ireland. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Some of his friends said "No, no!" but he was glad that opinion came from an English Member; it certainly could not come from an Irish Member. ["Hear, hear!"] They had last night a most important Irish Bill blocked by an English Member, who had never been in Ireland at all. [*Cheers.*] What was the state of affairs as to the tenants? The Member for Trinity College made that afternoon an extremely powerful speech, showing the hardships which the landlords had to endure. There was no Irish Member who did not know of such cases. They all knew that the landlords had suffered severely in the last 30 years. He did not believe that any Nationalist Member was anxious to rob the Irish landlords merely through vindictiveness. But what was the position of the tenants? How many thousands and tens of thousands were in distress? He would mention a case which came to his own knowledge within the last five hours. He could not give the names, but he should give the entire facts to any Member who doubted him. The case was this: there was a farm in a prosperous Ulster county. There were some fine buildings on it, the extent being 80 or 90 acres of land. The rent was fixed by the Land Commission, and the tenant was practically the owner. That tenant that afternoon offered the farm to a man home from Australia with a wife and three children. He was offered the land, stock, and farm for £300. The money was offered to him as a loan. The result of consideration was a letter to him from the man, asking that a situation might be obtained for him as a bus conductor or driver in London. [*Cheers.*] He told the man that he thought he was wise—["hear, hear!"]—and if his influence was as strong as he thought it was, that man would remain a London bus conductor and not an Antrim farmer. Only a few weeks ago he obtained from a Member of that House letters of introduction for two young men going out to Australia. They were forced to give up their farm, and at 35 years of age they were gone away to a new country without a penny in their pockets. The landlords' cases were unquestionably hard, but the instances he had given would show that the tenants' cases were also very hard. He had visited every one of the 32 counties of Ireland, and he knew that the position of the tenant farmers was one of extreme difficulty. He was certain, too, that the landlords had been hard hit. He had no reason to be more sympathetic with the tenant farmers than with the landlords; perhaps not so much, but he saw the difficulty from both sides of the question. One word with regard to the Commission which the Government intended to appoint. The landlords had asked for the Commission, the Nationalists had opposed it, and the Government had declared through the mouth of the Chief Secretary that the Commission was to be appointed. He was sorry that the Government had come to that conclusion; but at the same time he recognised the difficulty of the situation. A great deal had been said which he thought unjustifiable and unnecessary. It had been said, for example, that the Government in granting the Commission implied unfriendliness towards the tenant —[*Nationalist cheers*]. He was prepared for that cheer; but was not that a grave position for hon. Gentlemen opposite to take up in respect to a Commission the *personnel* of which they knew nothing? As a matter of fact the present Government had shown itself most favourable to the tenants. The Land Act of last year, for instance, was approved by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. It was now assumed that the Commission about to be appointed must be necessarily a Commission unfriendly to the tenants. One hon. Gentleman had said, "You won't give every litigant who is dissatisfied with the tribunal a Royal Commission to try the tribunal." That was one way of stating the case, but it must be borne in mind that the landlord was a compulsory litigant. [Mr. T. M. HEALY: "All dependents are!"] But what was the position of the Irish tenant? The Act of 1881 was an Act without parallel in the history of the world. [Mr. T. M. HEALY: "No!"] The hon. and learned Member was a very good historian, and he would be glad to have an illustration from him of any Parliament or Senate of any country ever having transferred the ownership of the entire land of the country from one class to another. [Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: "India!"] The Chief Secretary believed there was something like it in India. He was not aware of the case; but his reading of the Act of 1881 led him to believe that the Act transferred the ownership of the land from the landlords to the tenants, that the landlords were absolute owners previous to 1881; but that since every incidence of ownership belonged to the tenant, that now the landlord was a rent charge and nothing else. He would have preferred that this Commission had not been granted, but he saw the reasons which must have induced the Government to grant it, namely, that the circumstances of Irish landlords and Irish tenants were an extraordinary set of circumstances, and that therefore there was nothing unnatural in trying remedies in this case which had never been tried before, and would not be tried in any other case. Who was the appointment of the Commission to affect? He thought its appointment would have two results, and that those results, as regarded time, would be divided into two parts. First, what would be the effect of the Commission between now and when it reported; and, secondly, what would be the effect after it had reported? As to the first point, suppose these non-permanent Sub-Commissioners were terrified by the coming Commission, and that they were very cowardly, very contemptible, and very unworthy men. If that were the case, and if they were doing fairly at the present time in lowering rents, and if they ceased to lower rents as much in the future between now and the Report of the Commission, then they would do so from cowardice. His confidence in them was higher than that of the hon. and learned Member for Louth. He knew of no "trembling wretches." He believed that the Sub-Commissioners who were doing their duty fearlessly in the past, would do it fearlessly in the future, no matter what happened to them. If there were such "trembling wretches," the Debate that night would have the effect of letting them see that they were not likely to be crushed, and that they would have as many standing up for them on that side of the House as on the other side, and that they might do their duty fearlessly.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Does the hon. Member think that they keep their eye on the Debates in this House?

Mr. RENTOUL said he had reason to know they did. The hon. and learned Member for Louth had made his prophecy as to the effect of the Commission on these non-permanent Sub-Commissioners. He would make his prophecy, and that was, that there would be no effect upon them between now and the time it reported; that they would be very cowardly men who would be affected by it; and that the rents would not go down, and that there would be no appreciable difference in the conduct of the Land Commissioners between now and the time when the Royal Commission gave in its Report. As to the second point—what would be the effect of the Commission when it did report—he had so much confidence in the Land Commissioners that he believed its Report would be in approval of what the Land Commissioners had done. What was to be submitted to the Royal Commission? Not the *personnel* of the Land Commission, not the justice of their interference when they were fixing rents, but aye or no, were they doing their duty fairly, and were the reductions of rent at present given too great or too little in proportion to the present prices and the present difficulties of the farmers' position in general. He was not afraid of the judgment of the Commission in regard to that matter. He believed that the findings of the Land Commissioners would stand the test of the Royal Commission Inquiry, and that if any persons were in danger from the Report which it would make it would not be the tenants of Ireland. He did not, therefore, look upon the appointment of the Royal Commission as likely to be a boon to the landlords. They had asked for this Commission, and they were going to get it, but he questioned very much their wisdom in asking for it. He wanted the landlords of Ireland, who had now got their Commission, or would get it, to know the effect of the situation; and he wanted the tenant farmers to understand it, too. The tenant farmers might be extremely frightened when they heard that this Commission was about to be appointed. ["Hear, hear!"] But it was his earnest belief that there would be very little to frighten them, and that the Report would be a pat on the back for the Land Commissioners, for it would be found that they had done their duty fairly. That being so, he failed to see what the landlords could possibly gain. The situation was a difficult one from every point. One knew that the Irish landlords had suffered heavily, and one knew also that the difficulties of the tenants were no mere fictions. They saw in the past that the poverty of Ireland was so great when famine came that only a few weeks would bring the people to the verge of starvation, and sometimes to actual starvation. ["Hear, hear!"] That being so, he rejoiced at the Land Bill that was passed by the present Government. He believed that the hon. Member for North Louth said the Party he represented expressed their belief at the time that the Government had done well and honestly, and had acted a friendly part to the tenant farmers of Ireland in that Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] The Government had done nothing since to discredit their action on that occasion. They had now appointed a Commission. If it were true that they had appointed it in the interests of the landlords, and for the purpose of destroying the effect of the Land Act of last year, then, of course, the Government would be false to the tenant farmers, whom they then desired to benefit. But they had no proof of that whatever. Whilst he believed that the Commission would not do a particle of good, he was equally sure that it would do no harm whatever. The Government had granted it as an act of kindness to the landlords, who, he believed honestly, had been too hard hit, and he believed that too much had been done against them. But he believed also that they would get that satisfaction which people very often got from going to a Court of Appeal, only to find the decision of the Court below confirmed against them.

Mr. DENIS KILBRIDE (Galway, N.) had failed to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the hon. Member who had just sat down was a representative of the tenant farmers or of the landlords. The hon. and learned Gentleman began his speech by adverting to an illustration given by the hon. Member for East Mayo with regard to the composition of the Sub-Commissioners. He mentioned the name of a gentleman called Basset, who, he understood, was a constituent of his own. He (the speaker) took occasion to refer to the Return that was given to the hon. Member for South Down five or six weeks ago, and when he looked to see what the qualifications of Mr. Basset were, he found that he was a gentleman who never was obliged to make his living by the earning and the paying of rent. He held that the man who was best entitled to come to a just conclusion and form a just estimate of what fair rent ought to be between the average hard-working tenant and the fair landlord was the man who had practical experience of how to make, as well as of how to pay, rent. Mr. Basset might be an admirable man, and he did not desire to controvert anything that had been said in his favour. It might be true that he had a memorial signed by 200 farmers in the county of Down, it might be perfectly true that among these 200 there were some Nationalists, and it might be true that he had the signatures of both Protestant and Catholic ministers. But to bring that forward as proof of the fitness of any man in Ireland for any public position was trading upon the credulity of the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman knew, and those who sat around him (the speaker) knew—everyone of them knew that whether a man was a political friend or a political opponent, there was enough left, he was glad to say, of the milk of human kindness in the Irish heart to put a name to any memorial in favour of him. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. RENTOUL said he must remind the hon. Member that he did not bring forward Mr. Basset's name. He simply dealt with it by way of reply.

Mr. KILBRIDE: I dealt with it by way of illustration.

Mr. RENTOUL: And I by way of reply.

Mr. KILBRIDE: By way of reply in order to prove how unfortunate my hon. and learned Friend was in his illustration.

Mr. RENTOUL: Quite so.

Mr. KILBRIDE, continuing, said he found Mr. Basset described in the Return as a valuer and surveyor. He believed that for many years he was a clerk in the office of the Clerk of the Crown and Peace. [Mr. Rentoul: "Two or three years!"] That was how this gentleman acquired his knowledge of land. If the hon. Member for East Down wanted to defend Mr. Basset, why did he not tell the House what had been his occupation for years before he was put on the Sub-Commission? Had it been in his power to say, "This man is a practical farmer, he has paid rent because he made it," he would have been only too glad to say so. But he had kept back from the House—he said that advisedly—he had kept back his knowledge of the position this man held for years before his appointment as a clerk in the office of the Clerk of the Crown and Peace.

Mr. RENTOUL was sorry to interrupt, but he could not let that pass; otherwise it would seem that he was deceiving the House. The fact of Mr. Basset having been a clerk in the County Court had been already mentioned in the House before he spoke. He had no desire to keep back anything.

Mr. KILBRIDE said he did not remember hearing the fact referred to by any hon. Member. Mr. Basset, he found, had never farmed land for himself, either as owner or as tenant; but he had "farmed for a family." Well, he hoped that the "family" had a great deal of money; because he did not think that a clerk in a law office was the man most calculated to make a great deal of rent for a family.

It was stated that the Chief Secretary's reputation was at stake in making these appointments. He had no doubt the Chief Secretary acted as well as it was possible to do, and that he was actuated by a sincere desire to appoint the best and the most impartial men; but if that reputation had been at stake, surely it was now much more at stake since these appointments had been attacked by his own supporters. The right hon. Gentleman was responsible for the appointments, and was one of the objects of the Commission, therefore, to whitewash the tarnished reputation of the Chief Secretary? He commented on the fact that while the last speaker was neither a landlord nor a tenant farmer he was returned by the vote of tenant farmers, and while there were several gentlemen in the hon. and learned Member's constituency well qualified to act as lay Sub-Commissioners, only one appointment had been made. On the other hand, in other constituencies in the north of Ireland represented by landlords, several men had been appointed to act on the Land Commission. Were the Unionist and Presbyterian tenant farmers of Down satisfied with the rent reductions of the Sub-Commissioners? He ventured to tell the Committee that whether it was Nationalist farmers in Cork or Galway, or Unionist and Presbyterian farmers in Down and Antrim, they were all alike dissatisfied with the reductions they had received. While it was a regrettable thing to see country gentlemen, especially if they were sportsmen, being obliged to shut up their establishments and live in the cheaper Continental countries, still, that was a lesser evil than that large bodies of tenant farmers should be unable to find the necessaries of life for themselves and their families. A favourite argument on the other side was that the reductions in rent should be in direct proportion to the fall in prices, but his contention was that the Irish tenant farmers had not only been injuriously affected by the fall in agricultural values, but still more by the shrinkage in produce. But this shrinkage of produce was a thing that was carefully kept from the purview of the House by the advocates of the landlords. It never occurred to those hon. Gentlemen to recall the statement made by the present Judge Madden, then Attorney General, when he wanted the House to consent to the advance of 30 millions of British money to turn the Irish occupiers into Irish owners, the Irish landlords to run away with the swag—he told the House, on his responsibility as a Minister, that the interest of the tenant farmer in the soil was greater than that of the landlord. He should like to ask the representatives of the landlords why they, who were not absolute owners, but only co-partners with the tenants in going concerns, should expect 18 or 20 years' purchase of their interest, if the tenants, whose interest was declared by Mr. Justice Madden to be the greater, were not entitled to claim at least the same. The Marquess of Salisbury told a deputation of Irish landlords that in these days the interest which did not agitate was bound to go to the wall. He was glad that the noble Marquess had come to that conclusion, because at one time the most opprobrious term which could be applied to the Nationalist Members was that of "professional agitators." Now the whole of the Irish landlords, headed by the Duke of Abercorn, had successfully converted themselves into professional agitators. And if the landlords claimed to be heard in the House, it was equally within the rights of the tenant farmer to call attention to the fact that the reductions given by the Sub-Commissioners were wholly inadequate. The Chief Secretary would find that his policy of killing Home Rule with kindness would be made more difficult when they heard that this Royal Commission was to be appointed to decide whether they were to have any reductions or not. He had been anxious to hear the hon. Member for South Tyrone or the Attorney General for Ireland on this proposal, for they both represented tenant farmer constituencies. They must be opposed to it, for they knew that the Royal Commission was simply to whittle down reductions or to prevent the tenant farmers from getting any at all. It was said that the object of the Commission was to restore confidence in the Land Commission. How could it do that? If the Commission decided that the reductions given for the second statutory term were too great, would it establish confidence in the minds of the Irish tenant farmers? If the result of the Report was to restore the confidence of the landlords in the

Land Court, it would lead to a fierce agitation on the part of the tenant farmers to induce some Court to give them the reductions to which they were entitled. On the other hand, if the Report should be that the reductions in rent were only commensurate with the necessities of the case, how would that restore the confidence of the landlords in the Land Court? The landlords would never have any confidence in any Court that reduced rent. He was opposed to the appointment of the Commission, because he objected to any further interference by this House or any other body with the judicial functions exercised by the Land Commission Courts. This was an attack upon the judicial Bench in Ireland. If it was right for the landlords to attack the Land Commissioners in their capacity as Judges, it was right for the Nationalists to attack the decisions of any of the other judicial tribunes in Ireland. When, some years ago, the Nationalist Members attacked in the House certain Judges in Ireland for their partiality to the Government in political cases, they were denounced for their want of respect for law and order. Now the attacks on Irish Judges did not come from the Nationalist Members, but from the loyal and patriotic body on the other side of the House—from the men who had so long posed as the advocates and defenders of law and order in Ireland.

MR. H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.) said a more flagrant waste of public money than that involved in the Vote before the Commitee had never come under his observation. For what was the £130,000 to be spent? Was it to bring them to a final decision on the Irish land question? No; for no one had suggested that the Land Commission thus enforced would bring them one inch nearer to the end they desired to attain. The hon. Member for North Louth, with his usual acumen, tried to lead the Debate into a line which, if the colleagues of the hon. Member had followed, their speeches might have had more influence on the Committee. The hon. Gentleman had said that the House was asked to interfere with the decisions of a judicial body. The hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that an appeal like that was likely to be effectual with the House, but, unfortunately for him, a little light was thrown in the course of the Debate on those judicial bodies. The present system had been one long wrangle over the qualifications of this man or that man. Was there the slightest analogy between a judicial tribunal as we understood it in England, and this scratch pack of gentlemen who were performing a travesty of justice in Ireland? These gentlemen could not be compared with the early Judges who were appointed on the Land Commission, and who were permanent servants of the Crown. There were 53 of these temporary Assistant Commissioners, and he did not wish to say anything against them. He did not think anybody knew much about them, but they were human beings susceptible to the passions and temptations which swayed human beings, and it was very dangerous to set these men in judicial posts without taking steps to guard them against temptation. We made it our boast that our Judges, even in the humblest offices, were appointed for life, and were, therefore, removed from the temptation which any shorter appointment would lay them open to. It was inconceivable that these temporary assistants should not be suspected of being affected by such considerations. They had heard something as to the process by which they were selected. A member of the British Bench was selected by probably the fiercest form of competition to which a man could be subjected, namely, by the process of trial among his peers, and that, too, in one of the most competitive professions that existed. In addition to this they surrounded him with every precaution necessary in the interests of justice. They had heard, however, that these gentlemen were appointed on the strength of a shoal of testimonials. He did not blame the Chief Secretary, who had to make the best of the bewildering mass of information put before him, but that was not the way to obtain Judges in whom confidence could be placed. As an example of the sort of man who was appointed he cited the case of one gentleman, a tenant, chiefly self taught, who had visited various farms. That was not the qualification which was needed for settling for all time to come the affairs of a certain number of Her Majesty's subjects. They ought to have in a Judge the power to discern between two cases presented with equal force, and the faculty of impartiality. All this talk about the Land Commissioners, whether they were deciding fairly whether the rents should be lowered or raised was beside the mark. He did not think the problem was capable of solution by any tribunal which could be set up. Given this infinite multiplicity of sham Judges, they were no nearer finality on this question. In 1897 the Land Commissioners were beginning exactly where they were in 1881. The Courts were crowded with suitors, and hon. Members opposite said the plethora of cases in the Courts prevented decisions being given. Sheaves of applications for fair rents to be fixed were pouring in. Recent land legislation for Ireland had been exceptional legislation, and its inception was presented as a remedy for an emergency. A remedy for an emergency was not a remedy for all time. It was doing incalculable mischief to the landlords, and hon. Members opposite did not profess that any benefit had accrued to the tenant.

MR. DILLON: We said that so great had been the fall in prices that reductions of rent have not made the tenant as well off as under the old rent of 20 years ago. That is due to the agricultural depression.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that precisely the same complaint was made of the operations of the recent Land Acts as was made of the operation of the Land Act of 25 years ago. His point was that we were not advancing in this matter one inch, and the demoralisation that had occurred was beyond belief. He would appeal to English Members. They were apt to think they had but slight interest in this, but he would point out that the demoralisation had spread to this side of the water, and that already they had presented to the House a Bill based on predatory and dishonest principles in regard to the Principality of Wales. It was not based on the law of England, on the Ten Commandments, or on common sense, but was based line by line on the precedent followed in the Randt. What had been said by the First Lord of the Treasury was a summary of the whole of the possibilities of the question. It was impossible to go back to the state of things that existed before 1881. The First Lord of the Treasury had said that there was one issue, and one issue alone, out of this terrible *faux pas* into which they had got, and that was by doing away with dual ownership and restoring the single ownership of land. He agreed with this. He could not believe it was in the interest of any section in Ireland, except the attorneys, that the present condition of things should go on. He believed that this annually increasing Vote for the Land Commission was a curse to Ireland, and that the people who were living upon it were the lawyers. For every pound of rent reduction in Ireland since the Act of 1881 was passed, there had been an expenditure of two pounds to bring about that reduction. The cost of the maintenance of the Land Commission and the cost of litigation largely exceeded the whole of the reductions of rent. But whether that were so or not, nobody could pretend that what was happening was to the advantage of Ireland. He believed that until they looked on the Land Commissioners and their work in the daylight of common-sense, until they asked themselves whether they were doing things in Ireland which they should dare to see done in England and Scotland, they should not get much further in this matter. When they had noblemen like Lord Dufferin speaking as he had recently done on this question, it was calculated to make pause even the most enthusiastic advocate of the existing land system in Ireland. They were told that, among the many other miseries the Land Commission had inflicted upon Ireland, they were now doing all in their power to obstruct purchase, although everyone who wished well to Ireland desired that the wheels of the machinery of land purchase should be oiled. He believed that could be done even under the bad and incomplete system that existed. He believed it ought and could be improved with very little trouble, and he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for the University of Dublin that if purchase was to be made a success, it could only be made so on terms of ample generosity to the parties whose property was compulsorily taken from them.

MR. J. DALY (Monaghan, S.) regretted that the hon. Member opposite should have thought fit to call the Land Court a "sham" Court, and to apply the epithet "suspect" to the Judges of that tribunal. The hon. Member for West Belfast and those who acted with him had succeeded in cowing the Government who had bent the knee to the few landlords from Ireland who had seats in that House. Last year, when the Land Act was before them, they were told by the Government that they would hear nothing more about the land question for a very long time, and yet, before 12 months had elapsed since the passing of that Act, this proposal to appoint a Commission was made. He feared that the effect of this new policy would be to cow the Land Sub-Commissioners. There were few of the Sub-Commissioners who were not needy men, and when needy men had obtained appointments they were naturally disinclined to relinquish them. This action of the landlords he regarded as merely a game of bluff, although, no doubt, they had carried their point. Because the landlords, acting on the advice of Lord Salisbury, were agitating while the people were quiet and orderly, the former were going to be aided and the peasants injured. Perhaps the peasants would have to follow the landlords' example. They had heard from the right hon. and learned Member for Trinity College, Dublin, a good deal about the sorry plight of some of the landlords in Ireland. In considering their case, it should be taken into account that these gentlemen or their predecessors had lived very extravagantly in their time. If they had not done so, they would not be so hard up now. Time after time, when the privations and grievances of the people of Ireland had been brought forward in that House, it had been impossible to extract a sympathetic word from hon. Gentlemen opposite, but now, because a few landlords pretended that they were hard up, the right hon. and learned Member for Trinity College almost wept over their distress.

Mr. HUBERT DUNCOMBE (Cumberland, Egremont) claimed to move "That the Question be now put," but the Chairman of Ways and Means withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

Mr. J. DALY said that what distressed him was to see poor people leaving Ireland for America in order that they might earn rent for the landlords.

And, it being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again on Monday next.

Mr. J. Daly.

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

As amended, considered; Bill Read the Third time and passed.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION PETITIONS.

Select Committee appointed to inquire into the procedure and practice on Parliamentary Election Petitions, and to report to the House if any changes are desirable therein. The Committee was accordingly nominated of:—Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Gordon, Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Hedderwick, Mr. Wootton Isaacson, Mr. A. K. Loyd, Sir Robert Reid, and the Solicitor General. Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records. Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY gave Notice that the Second Reading of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill would be taken on Monday, and if not finished then it would be taken again on Tuesday, when there would not be a morning sitting. Wednesday would be left to private Members. On Thursday the first Order would be the Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, which ought to be passed as soon as possible into law. The second Order would be the Finance Bill. On Friday the South African Vote, as promised to the Leader of the Opposition, would be taken.

House Adjourned at Five Minutes after Twelve o'Clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 17th May 1897.

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 89.]

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA (HEALTH).

Debate on the Motion of the Earl of DUNRAVEN to resolve:—

> "That in view of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the India Office of the 20th day of February 1897, it is, in the opinion of this House, urgently necessary that an inquiry be made into the effect of contagious diseases upon the Forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within Her Majesty's dominions, and into the nature and results of the measures which are or have been in force in this and other countries for the prevention of such diseases."

Resumed (according to Order).

*LORD REAY said that no one who had been responsible for any part of the administration of India could fail to recognise the extreme gravity of this question. The whole tendency of modern legislation was in favour of making the public acquainted with the laws of hygiene and of enforcing hygienic conditions. They segregated lunatics, lepers, habitual drunkards; and there seemed to be no reason why the same principle should not prevail in this case. This protection of the public health was due to the conviction that society in self-defence had to legislate. The progress of medicine had placed at their disposal effectual means for dealing with this disease, and the object of the measures contemplated in the Secretary of State's Dispatch seemed to him to be to diffuse these means and to place them at the disposal of those who required them, and to leave no excuse for neglect, the result of ignorance. He hoped that the re-opening of the hospitals would be among the first steps to be taken, and that every inducement would be held out to visit these hospitals. Apart from the general considerations which governed this matter, there were special considerations which applied to India. In India the causes which operated in favour of restraint were not as strong as they were in this country. The factor of racial difference was a very important one to take into account, and their obligations as the ruling race could not be overlooked. From the very nature of the circumstances they were exposed in India to constant criticism by very subtle minds of everything which was left undone by the State. In India, besides, private initiative was much weaker than it was in this country; and what was left to the numerous charitable and benevolent agencies in this country must in India be undertaken by the State; hence the Government of India undertook a great many duties and functions which in this country were left to private initiative. At this very time our Indian Administrators were grappling, and he trusted sucessfully, with famine and plague. This scourge was more serious than the bubonic fever. The latter was not concealed, not chronic, and capable of prophylactic treatment. This visitation was permanent, occult, insidious. The utmost vigilance was needed. Another and most important aspect of this question was the moral aspect. They removed their young soldiers from those influences which surrounded their homes, and from which they were not removed where the Army system left them to serve with the colours in their own districts, and with men taken from all classes of society. They were removed to other parts of the world, to other climatic conditions, to surroundings which in many respects were not conducive to a high moral standard. He fully recognised what had been done for their benefit, but in this direction certainly more could and should be done. He had been very pleased to hear what the noble and gallant Lord had said of the Presbyterian chaplain at Meerut. He believed that more instances could be given of similar efforts by Army chaplains and by commanding officers. It was by individual effort and example that they would be able to strike at the root of this evil; and, if it was important to mitigate its results, it was certainly more important to remove its causes, to create a healthy environment, to improve the moral tone. The whole tone of society had been altered with regard to intemperance; that precedent was encouraging for those who believed that other evils might be grappled with in the same way—evils which struck at the vigour of our race. He heartily endorsed, therefore, the instructions which had been given to the Government of India in the 14th paragraph of the Secretary of State's Dispatch. There was no antagonism between the scientific means and the moral means which could be used to prevent and to cure disease. There was a double duty to be discharged by the combined forces of State agency and of moral and religious agency. The Government of India had a perfect right to expect that in their renewed endeavours to deal with this evil they should have all the support which could be given them both here and in India in order to remove this frightful blot on our civilisation. He agreed with the noble Earl opposite, the Under Secretary of State, that there was no further need for inquiry. The evidence contained in the Papers which had been laid on the Table seemed to him to be overwhelming; and delay seemed unwarrantable after the representations received from the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons showing that immediate action was necessary. One of the conditions, if not one of the foundations, of our rule in India was moral prestige; and he saw in the Instructions which had been given to the Government of India by Her Majesty's Government an endeavour to strengthen our moral prestige. ["Hear, hear!"]

*LORD LISTER, on rising to address the House for the first time, was received with cheers. He said: It is not necessary for me to add to the evidence already brought before your Lordships as to the appalling gravity of the subject referred to in the Resolution of the noble Earl or to the tremendous importance of syphilitic disease and its far-reaching effects, not only to the person who contracts it, but to innocent women and children and to future generations. On this point I make one remark, that there is perhaps no more difficult thing for a surgeon to do than to give advice to a man when it is safe for him to enter into matrimony when he has once contracted syphilis. I cordially welcome the action that has been taken by the Secretary for India in his recent Dispatch enacting that venereal disease shall no longer be allowed to run riot in the Army in India, as it has of late years, but that it shall be dealt with on the same principles as small-pox and other contagious or infectious diseases. I confess that for my part I should have been well pleased to have waited for the regulations which I believe the authorities in India are endeavouring to make, in accordance with the Dispatch of the Secretary of State, to see how far those regulations might be really efficient for the great object in view; but as the matter has been brought forward, I feel bound to say that the Dispatch has been hampered with restrictions which I cannot help fearing will seriously interfere with its utility. I will only refer to two of those restrictions. It is stated that there must be no compulsory and periodical examination of women, and the Dispatch proceeds to say that the cantonment rules which are in operation for other contagious or infectious diseases shall come into operation as regards venereal disease. Rule 5 says that—

> "If the medical officer for the time being in charge of any such hospital is informed, on testimony which he believes to be credible, that any person living in the cantonment is suffering from cholera, typhoid, smallpox, &c., he may, by notice, require such person to attend at the hospital at a time to be mentioned in such notice."

Then Rule 6 says—

> "If any person on whom any such notice as is mentioned in the last preceding rule shall have been served shall refuse or neglect to attend at the hospital in pursuance of such notice, he shall be deemed to be suffering from such disease as aforesaid, and to have refused to go to the hospital."

And then, Rule 7 sets forth that on the representation of the medical officer to the cantonment magistrate that such refusal has occurred, the person concerned who has refused may be expelled from the cantonment. Now, with regard to such diseases as small-pox, this regulation is, of course, perfectly satisfactory. Such a disease and the others enumerated carry upon their face the evidence of their existence by symptoms that any medical man can at once discern. But with venereal disease the case is totally different. In the early stages of the complaint, in which it is of the most essential consequence that it should be recognised—for efficient treatment depends upon early recognition—there is no general effect whatsoever produced upon the system.

The person appears to all ordinary examination perfectly healthy, and it is only by special examination, which it is enacted shall not be compulsory, that evidence of the disease can be obtained. How can any notice be given to the medical man that a person has such a disease? Who is to give the notice? In truth it is the fact of prostitution, not evidence of the presence of venereal disease, on which the authorities must proceed. It may possibly be said that the Dispatch of the Secretary of State may be so construed that the mere fact of prostitution may be regarded as affording reasonable probability that the disease exists, and, therefore, justifying action. If that be the construction put upon the Dispatch my objection on that point would of course fall to the ground; but this is just one of the matters on which I should have liked to have waited to see how the regulations could be framed. If they can be framed in the sense I have referred to they may be so far efficacious. Then as to periodical examination. Suppose that any woman affected with venereal disease has been examined, treated and cured, after a certain time there will be just the same reason for re-examination to ascertain whether she may not be again diseased as there was in the first instance, and, therefore, in order that the regulations may be effectual, there must be periodical examination. If it be said that this would be very like the reintroduction of the Contagious Diseases Acts, I must frankly confess that I have no objection in principle to these Acts. ["Hear, hear!"] It is admitted on all hands that prostitution cannot be dealt with criminally as an offence; but on the other hand if any woman chooses to place herself in such a position as to become a notorious source of serious danger to the community it seems to me only reasonable that public steps should be taken to minimise that danger. The Contagious Diseases Acts required that in order that any woman might be subjected compulsorily to examination a magistrate must be satisfied by sufficient evidence that she was a notorious prostitute. Of course, if there was any deficiency in the Act, not giving the woman charged the most ample chance of refuting the charge, that, of course, should be amended, but as regards the principle there seems to me nothing to be objected to. In the Act of 1866 there was one matter which I did not like, and that was that when the woman had been treated and was pronounced to be clear of the disease, she received a certificate of such healthiness which she was to carry about with her. Now that, I confess, savours pretty strongly of public licensing of immoral conduct; but in the Act of 1869 that was done away with. The certificate was no longer given to the woman but to the police authorities, and this surely was perfectly right, with a view to the necessary periodical examinations. The Acts made special provision for chaplains to attend the women under treatment in hospital, with a view to their moral improvement. And I have been informed, on what I believe to be credible testimony, that it was not a rare thing for them to be restored to a virtuous course of life; and this does not surprise me. I know as a hospital surgeon how very wholesome a moral influence residence in hospital does exert upon people of the lower classes. I have often thought a severe accident might often have been a blessing in disguise to these poor people, who have, perhaps, first learnt what respect and gratitude are. For I am proud to say in the medical profession the same humane and kindly care is given to the most degraded as to the most exalted. [*Cheers.*] And surely it was a most merciful thing to provide treatment for these women free of charge, and cure them of their loathsome diseases. I have a very old friend whom I highly respect, a clergyman, who, at the time the Contagious Diseases Acts were in operation, knew many clergymen connected with the towns where the Acts were in force, and he tells me that without one solitary exception all those persons expressed approval of the effects of those Acts. [*Cheers.*] If we turn to the effects upon the disease as such, I have been given to understand that medical men who visited the Lock Hospital in London at the time when it was used not only for ordinary cases but also for cases under the Contagious Diseases Acts, were struck with the extraordinary contrast between the two classes, as, indeed, must necessarily have been the case. The Government cases were, as a rule, very mild ones, because they had been taken in the early stages of the disease, while the converse was seen in the poor creatures who had come in of their own accord because they could walk the streets no longer. I have received a letter from a gentleman who has been for 14 years in medical practice in Brisbane in Australia, and who has now returned to England. He was in a peculiarly favourable position for judging of the effects of the Acts. At the outset he had a great objection to it on moral grounds, and when he first went there he took the chair at a public meeting in opposition to the Act. The Act, however, was not abolished, and he now speaks in unqualified approval of the effect of the Act in the town of Brisbane, venereal diseases in the whole community having become immensely reduced, not only in number, but in virulence; so that when any virulent case occurred they were able to trace it to outside places, where the Act did not operate. His only objection to the Act is that, as he says, the women are humbled, while nothing is done to deal with the men who may reinfect them. I confess that objection seems a somewhat sentimental one as regards the civil population, because, in the first place, I do not think the poor women need complain very much of the way in which they are treated; and, in the second place, to deal with the men in the civil population on the same lines is an absolute impossibility. But, on the other hand, this is by no means impossible in the Army—["hear, hear!"]—and I was exceedingly glad to hear that Lord Roberts approved of periodical inspection of the soldiers. I can conceive no objection whatsoever to such a course; only let it be done, not, as I am told it is sometimes done, in a sort of parade, where the young fellows seem rather to glory in having such diseases, but let every soldier be introduced, as it were solemnly, into the surgeon's room and examined on the understanding that it is a very, very serious matter. Every recruit is examined in this way. Those who are diseased would certainly have no ground of complaint; and those who are healthy may be made to feel that by undergoing these examinations they are contributing to the general good. Such periodic inspections of the men would unquestionably remove a great source of contamination, and render the Act still more beneficial. For my part, therefore, I see no objection to the Act; on the contrary, I think it was a most beneficent one; and I cannot help on this occasion expressing the hope that at no distant period it may be reintroduced into this country. [*Cheers.*] But, then, it is said, supposing it has worked well in this country, it has been a failure in India. No doubt in India it has not done all that was expected of it. One of the reasons for this is the short-service system already alluded to by other speakers, and the more frequent moving of the troops. And to these must be added, as a most important element, the imperfect and partial manner in which the Acts have been worked. With regard to this point I have important evidence from Surgeon-General Payne, who had medical control of the working of the Acts in Calcutta from 1869 to 1879, the former year being that in which the Acts came into operation. The Cantonment Act, which was introduced in 1864, did not apply to Fort William, but to the civil population of Calcutta only, and so acted only in an indirect way on the health of the soldiers. In a Dispatch to the India Office Surgeon-General Payne writes:—

> "The garrison of Fort William in 1872 illustrated the worst effects of a newly-arrived regiment bringing disease to those sections of the town which the soldiers frequent. At the close of 1871 the men of the 19th Foot left Calcutta, after two years' residence, almost without a case of syphilis. The headquarters' wing of the 114th Regiment took its place, coming from Cawnpore, where the men had suffered heavily from the disease. They were not inspected on their arrival. From their arrival to the end of April there were many cases admitted into hospital. . . . By the end of April the mischief was arrested. . . . The health of the garrison forcibly exemplified all that has been said, here and elsewhere, of the effect of the movement of troops. I had ventured to predict that the year 1873 would find the 114th Regiment as free from disease as their predecessors had become. The event fully justified the prediction, and, on the arrival of the 3rd Buffs, our former experience was utilised by the regimental authorities. There were 12 or 13 venereal cases under treatment at the time, and, at my suggestion, an inspection of the entire regiment was held. It resulted in the detection and removal to hospital of between 30 and 40 cases, and no new cases occurred for months afterwards."

This seems to me to be most important evidence. ["Hear, hear!"] It is further stated by the same authority that within the first four years during which the Act was in operation under his supervision, taking cases of primary disease originating in Calcutta, the percentage was reduced from 7 per cent. to 1·4 per cent. That is exceedingly important evidence as to what, even in India, can be done if the Acts are energetically and properly worked. ["Hear, hear!"] I am aware that in remote districts there may be especial difficulties; but I am pleased beyond measure to hear Lord Roberts state that in his opinion, without anything that can be fairly construed as a direct encouragement of vice, measures might be taken in the cantonments which would have the effect of enormously diminishing the evil of which we are speaking. I trust, therefore, my Lords, whether the Inquiry which the noble Lord has requested be instituted or not—and I confess I myself would rather see it deferred, for fear it might appear, as in the case of the Vaccination Commission, to hold out the idea that the case was not sufficiently proved—[*cheers*]—I trust, whether the Inquiry be instituted or not, that this House will give distinct encouragement to the Government of India to persevere in the good and Christian course on which they have entered. [*Cheers.*]

*Lord PLAYFAIR said that the speech of his distinguished Friend who had just addressed the House was very important from a medical point of view. But he thought that Lord Lister did not give sufficient importance to the fact that, unless the new regulations were made sufficiently consonant with public feeling, it would be impossible, without a great struggle, to carry them into effective operation either in this country or in India. ["Hear, hear!"] Public opinion was now risng very much in favour of effective measures being taken to remove what was a great scandal to the nation. The evidence was perfectly conclusive as to the increase, not only in extent, but in malignancy, of the disease among our troops in India; and the public should never forget what a disease it is. It is a disease which the great specialist Ricord described as "the most terrible contagion which ever threatened mankind." It is terrible to the sufferer and to his descendants. Ordinary diseases exhausted their ill effects on the persons attacked by them; but syphilis descended to innocent children of parents tainted by it, either by direct transmission or by the degeneration of their constitution. Other diseases which followed from it on account of degeneracy of constitution had very much increased. The public should satisfy themselves on one point—it had been conclusively proved that the disease could be controlled by hygienic agencies. Those agencies had failed of recent years, because they had not been properly and efficiently carried out. The disease, in its major form, was prevented to a great extent in all the armies of European nations, while England was the only nation which allowed it to be dangerously prevalent among its soldiers, both at home and abroad. When the German army had succeeded in reducing the ratio of syphilis to 5½ per 1,000, was it not scandalous that the English Army at home should have a ratio of about 100 to the 1,000, and that in India of at least 175 per 1,000? ["Hear, hear!"] No doubt service in an Eastern country rendered it more difficult to repress the disease; but other countries had to encounter these difficulties. The Dutch soldiers serving in the East Indies suffered from the minor forms of venereal disease to a large extent, but they kept under control the major form of the disease, which prevailed only to one-third of the extent among our British troops. The Dutch army in the East Indies formerly had a ratio of syphilitic disease among their troops of 47 in 1,000, but this had been reduced in recent years to 37 per 1,000; while the English Army in India had a ratio of 175 to 1,000, and this had increased in recent years to 259 per 1,000. It was obvious that our bad administration of hygienic measures was responsible for the state of the British Army in India. Racial differences no doubt largely influenced the susceptibility of individuals in regard to the disease; but even these could not explain why, for all forms of venereal disease, the Japanese army had the low ratio of 34 to 1,000, while the British Army in India had 500 to 1,000. The United Kingdom might justly boast that since 1845 it had led the way in all sanitary reforms, and had greatly improved the health and lessened the mortality, while it increased the working ability of all classes of the population. There was only this exception—that in regard to this one class of diseases, the most repulsive and horrible of all, England stood now far behind all European nations. In the Report of the

Departmental Committee the following statement was made:—

> "Improved sanitation has had the very greatest effect upon every disease other than venereal; this alone has not only been unchecked in recent years, but has increased to an extent which is appalling and disastrous."

Up to 1887 the sanitary regulations in India, though they were inefficient to extirpate this class of diseases among our soldiers, were at least effective in preventing their increase. But in 1887 Parliament intervened, on account of the supposed State approval of an immoral trade, and since then the obnoxious regulations had been repealed by successive Secretaries of State for India, but no new powers had been given to the military authorities to apply more efficient sanitary measures. There was no want of knowledge as to how the disease could be prevented. There were moral means of prevention; and there were physical means, both excellent when worked in co-operation; but unfortunately they had drifted into a sharp antagonism. ["Hear, hear!"] The religious and moral agencies had tried to impress upon the soldier the heinousness of the sin which led to the disease. Lord Roberts had described the measures which had been adopted to remove soldiers from temptation by establishing reading rooms and regimental workshops, while various means of occupation and recreation had been furnished. Societies for promoting temperance and for repressing vice had done good work in the Army. The fruit of these combined efforts were seen in the general elevation of morality in the Army. Drunkenness and crime had greatly lessened among our soldiers in India. Yet all those social and moral agencies had failed to stay the increase of venereal diseases among our troops. They had failed as completely as the weakened sanitary regulations in use since 1887. The basis of all hygienic measures for preventing the spread of contagious diseases was isolation of the diseased from the healthy, and the application of curative methods to the diseased person. Parliament had in recent years enforced notification of contagious diseases such as cholera, small-pox, scarlet fever, and typhoid from the individual patient to the sanitary authority, which was empowered to see that isolation was effective, either at the home of the patient or in the hospital. This law of notification and isolation had been extended to our Army in India and prevailed in cantonments; but, though applicable to zymotic diseases generally, was no longer applied to the foul and malignant disease of syphilis. Yet it had been known for centuries that isolation was the only effective means of preventing the extension of this disease. Thus in 1497 Edinburgh was violently attacked by syphilis, then called "grandgore," and the Privy Council of Scotland ordered the magistrates of Edinburgh to collect, on a certain day, all the diseased women, accompanied by their doctors, on the sands of Leith, where boats were provided to transport both women and doctors to the island of Inchkeith—[*laughter*]—and there the women had to remain until the disease was cured on pain of being branded. This was a high-handed isolation, but could only be partially successful, because the diseased men do not seem to have been isolated. Compulsory isolation, as now applied by law to zymotic or filth diseases, ought still more rigorously to be applied to venereal diseases. The military authorities, in regard to venereal diseases, should at least have as full powers as those given by the Diseases Notification Act. They should, therefore, be enabled to discover the cases of disease and to enforce the effective isolation of the diseased. There was a fear that the active interference of the State in grappling with the evils of a dangerous immoral trade, overtly carried on among our soldiers, implied a State recognition and approval of the trade. Recognition there certainly was, but approval was not implied in making regulations for the supervision of any dangerous trades. ["Hear, hear!"] At one time the Church was intrusted with regulating the immoral traffic in cities, but though that involved recognition it did not imply approval of notorious sin. In 1430 the Bishop of Winchester was charged by Ordinance to regulate and supervise 18 houses of bad repute which stood on Bankside, Southwark, but this involved no Episcopal approval of the immoral traffic carried on in them. The Secretary of State for India, in his Despatch of March 27, had been careful to point out how much more efficient regulations could be applied in the cantonments in India without recurring to those measures which affected the public feeling in this country. If the societies for the prevention of vice were satisfied with these assurances they might aid the authorities very much by co-operating with them in their renewed endeavours, by every form of moral and hygienic agency, to remove the national scandal of our Army being the worst in Europe in regard to those loathsome diseases. The case was urgent, and admitted of no delay. But the Resolution proposed by the noble Lord for a new Inquiry would certainly be used by the opponents of hygienic measures as a justification for further postponing the more active measures promised in the Dispatch of the Secretary of State for India. So far as they went they were good proposals, though they did not go far enough, but if they were effective in removing the antagonism and securing the co-operation of the religious and moral societies which acted on public opinion in 1887 and forced the military authorities to weaken their administration of the regulations, he looked with hope to this new effort of the Government. If it was met in the manly spirit of co-operation indicated in the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury he would have great hopes of the success of the new measures indicated in the Dispatch. Hygienic prevention and moral prevention could well work in co-operation. He trusted that this would be the spirit which might in future prevail among the societies which arose under different conditions. At present, if he might judge from circulars which he had received in the last few days, they still seemed inclined to retain their old position of antagonism to hygienic regulations. He did not want them to alter their attitude of watchfulness; but why should they not join their means of moral improvement with those of hygienic improvement and help the authorities to restrain a frightful disease which was rapidly increasing in extent and malignancy among our soldiers in India? ["Hear, hear!"]

*THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, after the able speeches which you heard on Friday night from Lord Roberts and from the noble Earl who brought the subject forward, and after the admirable way they were supported to a great extent by the Primate, I am hardly justified in intruding myself on your Lordships on this occasion, having no further personal responsibility with matters connected with the Army. But having been so long at the head of the Army, and having had for many years the opportunity of seeing the effects that existed before all those regulations were done away with, I must entreat of you to reflect well before you come to any resolution adverse to what has been brought to your notice by the noble Earl. No one can have any adequate idea of the miserable results produced by the doing away of the regulations, especially in India. But I do not take up this matter from the Army point of view, though that is of the greatest importance; I take it up from the civil point of view. We must always bear in mind that a large number of young men must now annually return from India; and if they return in a condition to propagate this horrible disease in the civil community at home the misery caused is untold. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore we ought to lose no time in putting a stop, if possible, to the laxity, or whatever you like to call it, with which this subject has been treated of late years, particularly in India. I have a very strong opinion also that morality would not suffer. I firmly believe, from all I have heard, that many of those poor creatures who formerly suffered, and propagated this miserable disease, absolutely gave up their immoral life as a result of the cure which they had obtained in good hospitals, and because they found that if they continued their immoral life they would become altogether outcasts of the world. The result was that they gave up this very vice which everybody wishes to see modified. I say modified, because the most rev. Prelate will forgive me for saying that you must change human nature before you can get rid of the vice altogether. ["Hear, hear!"] I am afraid even the Bench of Bishops, with his Grace at their head, cannot effect that object, but can only look forward to the mitigation of this vice. I support most fully and entirely the views which were expressed by the most rev. Prelate, but the difficulty is to find the means of effecting his object. Lord Roberts has told you, and I tell you also on the part of the whole Army, that we do everything, and have done everything of late years, to facilitate and make acceptable the barrack life of the soldier. We have introduced—and the noble Marquess near me will, no doubt, if he speaks, express the same view—every sort of recreation and useful occupation and interest that can ameliorate the monotony of barrack life. This has been gradually and is daily being introduced into our service, and more particularly in India, where it is more required even than at home. A great improvement in the soldiers' condition and the soldiers' sentiments has been produced as a result, and it is felt by the military authorities that the more this policy is carried out and the more we do in that direction, the better. This will have a great effect, I hope, in time in producing morality to a greater extent than it exists at this moment among Her Majesty's Forces. I do not believe myself that you can absolutely look forward to any very great mitigation of this miserable condition of things unless you treat the subject fully and fairly on its own merits, or, rather, I should say, its demerits. The demerits are so plain that I cannot conceive that anybody who has right or proper feeling, or delicacy of feeling, can have any doubt on that subject. I can only tell your Lordships that this subject is of such enormous importance to the civil population that not a day, not an hour, should be lost in introducting stringent and decided regulations, and every effort should be made to put a stop to what is really a most miserable and cruel condition of things. Imagine the civil population infected with this miserable disease! A great many of the men who come home are, I know, very seriously diseased. You cannot control them; they go into the civil population; you do not even know what becomes of them; and then they propagate this very horrible disease. This is owing to the laxity, if I may say so, with which we have looked after our men in India. The disease can certainly be controlled in India, though it may not be easy to control it elsewhere. One of the reasons why it is not controlled as it ought to be is, I am sorry to say, that the medical inspections referred to by the noble Lord are not carried out now as they used to be. ["Hear, hear!"] In my early days there was no sort of hesitation in regard to the matter; nobody questioned for a moment that every individual soldier should be inspected once a week. I do not see why this disease is to be treated on a different footing from smallpox, or any other disease the subjects of which are immediately taken to the hospital and there dealt with. Without inspection we are not in a position to deal with this disease because we know nothing about it. Nobody of either sex would confess to such a disease unless there are means of finding out that it exists. I, for one, was always strongly of opinion that medical inspection was essential, not only in the interests of the Army, but of the population at large. I regret, therefore, more than I can say, that I was not able to carry out those views which I personally entertained. I think we ought to lose no time in the matter. I quite agree with the noble Lord that if it is found essential to go further into details, it should be done, but I should hardly think it was, because I think we have details enough to satisfy any reasonable mind. [*Cheers.*] If there is a necessity for further statistical information be it so, but do not on that account delay for an hour or a moment the regulations, rules, and orders which are required. If they are not found strong enough, I hope there will be no hesitation in going even further, although it is distasteful, I know, in many quarters. It is a most fearful thing that the general population of this country should be in danger of infection, and that the happiness of the generations to come should also be endangered. ["Hear, hear!"] It is not only to the present, but to the future, that we must look, and there will be much danger to future generations if something very serious is not done. I have no idea what Her Majesty's Government intend to do, but I hope they mean absolutely to stick to their determination to go on with those regulations which they have already decided to carry out in India. If those are not found sufficient to mitigate the disease, I hope they will go on with stronger regulations and stronger rules, progressing with caution and prudence, and without hurry, in order to reduce it in every way that is possible. In the meantime, whilst doing that, everything that can be done should be done to prevent the young men shut up in barracks from being induced to overlook that morality which we all would like to see, not only in the Army, but in every portion of Her Majesty's dominions. [*Cheers.*]

*THE BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL thought the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Roberts) scarcely gave credit to the wider range of differences that existed between those who regarded this matter from different points of view. The attitude which had been adopted by some of those who were opposed to these regulations had been characterised as unchristianlike, but it should not be forgotten that it was also unchristianlike to purchase small children to fill up the bazaars for our soldiers, or to take possession of native women for our soldiers' use. We might find, moreover, that this was dangerous from a statesman's point of view, and might give even more cause for discontent and disturbance in India than did in the past certain memorable cartridges. He thought that the periodic examination of the soldiers which had been alluded to might remove one of the chief objections to which importance had been attached—namely, that there should be no difference of treatment between the men and the women. If future statistics dealt with regiments, good and bad marks might be attached to regiments as to individuals, and penalties should be attached personally to colonels of regiments which showed moral deterioration. He lived many years in a garrison town, and he knew that the character of a regiment depended very much on its colonel. If those under him, when a head-master of a public school, or now, as Bishop of a diocese, deteriorated, it would be quite right if he were removed. He did not see why there should not be some kind of official judgment on the heads of regiments as well as on the soldiers themselves. As to a further inquiry, he hoped the details obtained by the last Commission would not have to be repeated and gone through again. No good would be done by it. ["Hear, hear!"] One thing was made clear by the old Report—that waves of virulence such as had occasioned the present movement were not due either to the Acts being carried out or neglected, but to local conditions due to some campaign in new countries under degraded conditions of life. This was not a matter for Parliamentary inquiry, but for the Standing Sanitary Commission, which, they might presume, was doing its duty in trying to investigate it. If the statistics and Reports of the Sanitary Commission were to be disregarded, while however grudgingly their Reports must be admitted to have been against the Acts, he could not see the use of any fresh Commission being established to be disregarded again if it contradicted the opinion of those who did not agree with it. The learned scientific advisers who had spoken had not touched the chief question that affected the Contagious Diseases Acts. In India it might be possible, without any kind of moral objection, to have a periodical examination insisted upon of all women engaged in the different cantonments. But he trusted that the only other method of dealing with it—the one on which the whole character of the Acts depended in the countries of Europe—would never be sanctioned. But it is ordained in the second Act attached to the late Dispatch from the India Office, in which it was the duty of soldiers to denounce those who had communicated disease. This evening's Debate had removed the question from India to England. In England there is no machinery possible but police control. A revival of the system of denunciation would revolt the English mind. They had sufficient evidence of the intolerable servitude which was entailed by the foreign system of licensed prostitution. They knew the hopeless and defenceless condition of the young women, and the magisterial corruption which had been brought before them as supporting the police abroad in the different methods of blackmail and persecution. Life would not be tolerable to women of the working classes under such espionage. Espionage itself was a thing of which our country had happily been free, and he trusted nothing would be established in the nature of that terrible engine of oppression involved in the system of denunciation. This was the real objection to the Acts being revived. He knew of no other way in which they were enforced in any country in which they existed. So he appealed strongly against any revival of the Acts themselves, while he would gladly give his hearty co-operation to any reasonable methods of hygienic or sanitary reform.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The MARQUESS of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, the action of the military authorities has been so frequently referred to during this Debate that I think your Lordships will expect that I should say one or two words as to the manner in which the War Department regards the proposal contained in the Secretary of State's Dispatch. My Lords, we entirely accept the policy of that Dispatch, and we believe that policy is applicable to the British Army not only in India, but in whatever part of the Empire it may be found. Lord Lister, in his very weighty speech just now, expressed the opinion that the new cantonment rules which might be issued under these instructions might possibly not go far enough to be effectual. That may, possibly, be the case, but I am able to tell him that similar rules were enforced not long ago in India, and those best able to judge anticipated for them a success which, of course, they were not permitted to achieve because they were repealed within a few months of the date when they were first enacted. It should be remembered that these rules rely not only on the compulsory power of detaining in hospital all women who have been ascertained to be diseased, but upon the prospect that these poor creatures, when they find hospitals are open for them and that in those hospitals they are kindly and humanely treated, will gladly, of their own accord, go into hospital rather than submit to the other alternative, which, as you are aware, is that of expulsion from the cantonments. But, my Lords, whether I am right or wrong as to this, I would venture to insist that in cases of this kind, profiting by our former experience of the question, we shall be wise if we lay ourselves open to the charge of lagging a little behind public opinion, rather than to the charge of going far ahead of it. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not propose to detain you with any reference, or, at any rate, any lengthened reference to the statistics which have been brought forward. My Lords, in this matter statistics may be used for two purposes. They may be used in order to show that the Acts to which reference has been made were or were not successful in achieving the desired object; or, again, they may be used merely for the purpose of showing that the existing situation is so serious as urgently to demand effectual action on the part of the Government. With regard to the statistics as far as they illustrate the effect of the now repealed Acts and regulations, I readily admit that they require reading with great care and discrimination before anyone can say with absolute confidence that the case is proved by the figures; because, as has been said, the case is greatly complicated by the fact that the conditions of service in India have been greatly varied by the introduction of short service, which obviously renders the soldiers of the Army much more liable to this great danger. There is another complication in the statistical view of the case, which is this—that from time to time these diseases are reclassified by the medical authorities, and I have always found in all medical statistics persons are apt to be misled owing to the fact that the same ailment was described at different times under different names. Then, as Lord Roberts told you, there is a question whether these Acts were always administered in a proper and intelligent manner, or whether, as he evidently supposed, they were frequently given effect to in a very fitful and blundering fashion. I say, therefore, I have no wish to insist too much on the value of statistics in order to show the efficacy of the repealed Acts. But when we come to the value of the figures as denoting the growth and serious condition of things in the British Army, I think we may say without hesitation that the case is an overwhelming one. [*Cheers.*] It appears not to be disputed that out of a small Army of 70,000 soldiers in India in the year 1894, no less than 20,000 had been affected by the graver form of this disease; nor is it denied that of the whole of that force only a minority of 37 per cent. had been altogether free from disease of one kind or another. These figures appear to me to constitute an overwhelming case. ["Hear, hear!"] I have often heard complaint that the interests of the Army at home were subordinated to the interests of the Army in India. My Lords, we bear as cheerfully as we can the sacrifice which the home Army is called upon to make for the sake of the Indian Army, but I think we have a right to say it is not part of the contract that the men whom we land in India, and who are the very flower of the British Army, should, owing to our own neglect, come back to us withered and tainted by this horrible complaint. We haggle with the Treasury over the price of two or three battalions; but here is an enemy which literally decimates the British Army, and places men *hors de combat*, not by hundreds, but by thousands. And the case is equally serious when we come to consider the injury sustained by the civil population. We have it here that of the 13,000 men who year by year come back to this country from India only about 5,000 are altogether clean and free from diseases of this kind. There is another point which has, I think, been fairly established, and that is that the present condition of the law in India has become intolerable. I am tempted to say that the present condition of these regulations in India — regulations which, as your Lordships have heard, treat this particular form of disease as privileged, as a form of disease not to be treated as other infectious and contagious diseases are— I am tempted to say that the condition of these regulations is a rather instructive example of the results of dealing with important questions of this kind precipitately and under the influence of strong emotion or excitement. ["Hear, hear!"] I hope we shall avoid that error upon the present occasion. Your Lordships probably recollect the history of this case. Some ten years ago the circular to which the right rev. Prelate referred—a most improperly-worded and unfortunate circular—came to light. A great shock was given to the public mind, and thereupon a Resolution of the House of Commons was passed. That Resolution was peremptory in its terms, but very vague in its language. It was virtually an Act of Parliament, although it underwent none of that close discussion and detailed examination which under the practice of Parliament all Acts undergo. The Government of India endeavoured loyally to give effect to that Resolution, but subsequent inquiries disclosed the fact that in many districts the local military authorities, instead of keeping carefully within the terms of the instructions which had been issued to them, to some extent disregarded those instructions. There was another outbreak of indignation at the thought that the rules which had been agreed upon, after careful discussion, between the India Office and the Government of India should be thrown into the waste-paper basket, and an Act was imposed upon Lord Elgin's Government—an Act which was, to the best of my belief, either mischievous or useless, and which was greatly resented by the unofficial members of Lord Elgin's Council. I mention these things, not because I have any desire to rake up old controversies—we can occupy ourselves in a better way than that—but because I trust we shall avoid in the future the kind of mistakes which we have committed in the past. I certainly do not impute to those who differ from us anything but the most absolute honesty and sincerity of purpose. Nor, on the other hand, can I find the heart to blame very seriously those unfortunate soldiers who, desiring to shield their men from the consequences of this terrible scourge, found themselves with one foot across the very badly defined frontier line which Parliament had laid down for their guidance. ["Hear, hear!"] The noble Earl who brought this matter forward suggested to your Lordships that further inquiry might be desirable. For my part I have heard with great pleasure the statement made by successive speakers that there is no occasion for such inquiry, and I trust that it will not be pressed for. As far as I am able to judge, except among a few extreme partisans, there is no difference of opinion either as to the facts or as to the direction in which we should look for a remedy. As to the state of the case outside India, there is already in the published statistics a very sufficient account of the health of the troops at the different colonial stations. The figures show that British troops suffer more than the troops of any foreign country. They also show, I think, that Lord Playfair was correct in his statement that there must be something radically wrong in the manner in which this question is dealt with in the stations abroad occupied by British troops, as compared with foreign stations occupied by the troops of other countries. I will mention two cases. At Singapore compulsory examination was abolished on January 1, 1888, and immediately afterwards 200 women left the Lock hospital in a state of disease. An enormous increase in the admission rate and "constantly sick" rate immediately commenced and has gone on ever since. The rates of admission have about trebled since 1887. For example, in 1885, 1886, and 1887 the rates were 131, 134, and 197 per 1,000; since then they have varied from 400 to 600 per 1,000. The other case, to which I will refer by way of contrast, is the case of Malta. There, owing to the strenuous opposition of the local Press and non-official members of the Council of Government, the repealing ordinance was rejected and a local Act remains in force. The admission and "constantly sick" rates have shown remarkable fluctuations, but in the last few years have averaged less than one-half of the rates at Gibraltar, the average of admissions being about 150 per 1,000. With regard to the home Army we have figures for the 14 stations where the Acts were in force, and comparing these figures with the statistics relating to 14 other large stations they again appear to show conclusively that, whereas while the Acts were in force the protected stations enjoyed comparative immunity from these diseases, after the repeal of the Acts the non-protected and the protected stations became very much on a par. I have heard the suggestion that the practice followed in foreign countries might be inquired into. I doubt very much whether any inquiry into the manner in which these questions are dealt with in foreign countries would be of great advantage to us. The comparative immunity enjoyed by the armies of foreign countries is, of course, notorious; but so is the fact that foreign armies differ in many essential particulars from the British Army, and also the fact that foreign Governments are allowed to do many things which the Government of this country would never be permitted to do. I cannot see that any comparison between an army recruited by voluntary enlistment and a conscript army, between an army recruited entirely from many different classes of society and an army which is recruited entirely from one class of society—and that a class in which you cannot expect to find the highest level of education or the greatest self-restraint—I cannot bring myself to believe that such a comparison would really be very instructive. ["Hear, hear!"] I entirely agree with what was said by the right rev. Prelate when he told the House that he trusted that in this country we should never introduce a system lending itself to these practices of police espionage and police restraint, which may perhaps be tolerated abroad, but which, I am convinced, the people of this country would never tolerate. I would prefer to consider what is practicable here—given the conditions of our Army and the conditions of British society—rather than take a leaf out of the book of any foreign country. With regard to the Dispatch of the Secretary of State, I hope your Lordships will observe that we do not by any means limit our proposals to the mere re-enactment of these cantonment rules. The Dispatch indicates very clearly the directions in which other remedies may possibly be found. Let me in particular call attention to the suggestion that a larger measure of control may be desirable over the disorderly population which frequent not only the cantonments themselves, but the country immediately adjoining cantonments. I have always heard it said; and I believe with truth, that many of the apparently unaccountable outbreaks of this disease at certain stations in India have been due not to the intercourse of the men with the women ordinarily dwelling in the cantonments, but with vagrant, nomad people who have been hanging about the rough ground often to be found outside the limits of the station, and who in many cases have beyond all question been the means of introducing disease of the most dangerous kind into the cantonments. I am also not without suspicion that even in this country a little more vigilance might be usefully exercised over the persons who frequent barracks, and also perhaps over some of the lower public houses and other places frequented by soldiers. But that is a matter as to which I am not yet prepared to make a positive statement. As to our dealings with the soldier himself, it has been pressed upon us by more than one speaker that we should deal equally with the two sexes. That is, so far as the limits of possibility allow it, the principle upon which the proposed practice is founded. We consider that it is our duty to prevent any person who is notoriously diseased, from continuing to spread that disease, and as a matter of fact, the soldier, if he conceals the fact that he is suffering from disease of this kind, is detained in hospital until he has recovered his health. A suggestion was made by his Royal Highness and another speaker that we should do well to revert to the old practice of periodically examining the men. ["Hear, hear!"] I have discussed that proposal with many high authorities, and I am bound to tell your Lordships that the conclusion to which I am disposed to arrive is that this practice of regular inspection did not produce the desired effect, and that it was, on the contrary, regarded, and rightly regarded, by the men as a brutalising and degrading practice. It is a practice which has gradually disappeared, and I confess that I should be extremely sorry to see it reintroduced. I need not dwell on the suggestion in the Dispatch that no pains should be spared in order to increase the comfort and decency of the soldier's life in barracks. As to that there is no difference of opinion. Large sums of money have been spent in India, in some measure due to the personal influence of Lord Roberts, on regimental institutes; and his Royal Highness is aware that there has been a very large expenditure at home on recreation establishments in which the men are given every facility for interesting and amusing themselves in the hope that these influences may tempt them away from the low associations in the midst of which they so often contract these diseases. I cannot resume my place without saying a word in reply to the moving appeal made on Friday to your Lordships by the most reverend Prelate. The most reverend Prelate earnestly entreated us to approach this question not merely from the standpoint of the health and the fighting efficiency of the troops, but from the higher standpoint of religion and morality. The most reverend Prelate suggested, I think, that there was a time when the military authorities cared only for the effect of immoral living on the efficiency of the men intrusted to them, that they were indifferent to immorality in itself, if they did not actually encourage it. I doubt whether there has ever been a time when you would have found an English commanding officer so cynical as to tell you that, provided his men were sound in wind and limb and able to turn out in an efficient condition for service in the field, it was a matter of indifference to him whether in their private life they were the greatest ruffians and blackguards in the world. But this I can certainly say, that at the present time there is the strongest possible feeling among the commanding officers that all pains should be taken to raise the moral tone of the men for whom they are responsible. ["Hear, hear!"] I cannot resist bringing to your Lordships' notice one little piece of evidence in confirmation of what I have said, upon which I came almost by accident, and which I need not say was not provided with any idea that this discussion was to take place. I hold in may hand a memorandum recently issued by the general officer in command of the troops in Cape Colony. This is what General Goodenough writes:—

> "Sensual indulgence is a breach of the law of every religion. It is also a violation of the natural laws conducing to health. . . . It seems the clear duty of commanders in every grade to lead men to a mode of life which will enhance their self-respect and keep them from physical deterioration; and it is to be believed that, among other means, advice, guidance, and a certain amount of plain speaking, which is not derogatory and need not degenerate into coarseness, will undoubtedly have their effect in inducing by degrees a better state of things than now prevails. The General therefore wishes to enlist the aid of commanding officers and of all under them in the endeavour to raise the tone of feeling and opinion in the several commands through the exercise of this advice, guidance, and plain speaking."

["Hear, hear!"] Those views are, I believe, the views entertained by every thoughtful commanding officer in the Army. Although it is idle to suppose that we can expect all these young soldiers shall lead immaculate lives, I do sincerely hope that the result of efforts like these will be, after a while, distinctly to raise the tone of the private soldier in the British Army. Working on these lines, and supported, as I trust we shall be, by both sides in this discussion, I hope we shall be able to mitigate in some way the cruel suffering which the unchecked course of these terrible diseases have brought upon both the military and the civil population of these islands. [*Cheers.*]

*The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I was extremely glad to hear the noble Marquess begin his observations by saying that it was desirable to proceed in this matter with caution; and he referred in support of that view to the history of these enactments during the past few years. It so happened that it unfortunately fell to my lot when I was Secretary of State for India to deal with the then state of the law in India. The noble Marquess referred to the Resolution passed by the

House of Commons in 1888; and he said that it was not very precise. I am sorry to say that it seems to me to have been only too precise. The words of the Resolution are:—

> "Any mere suppression of measures for compulsory examination of women, or for lessening and regulating prostitution in India is insufficient, and the legislation which enjoins, authorises, or permits such measures ought to be repealed."

That is a very distinct Resolution indeed, and so it must have been felt by the noble Viscount (Lord Cross), because he issued peremptory instructions that the terms of this Resolution should be conformed to by the Government of India. When I returned to the India Office there was a strong remonstrance put before the Government against the state of things then prevailing in India; and it was stated that, although these instructions had been given, they had not been fully carried into effect. I felt myself then simply bound by the Resolution of the House of Commons and the instructions which had been given. It was perfectly idle to suppose that we as a Government could have procured a reversal of that Resolution. In point of fact, therefore, it remained binding upon us. It was peculiarly distasteful to me to have to deal with the matter, because I was always in principle in favour of stringent measures for the prevention of this horrible disease. But I conceived that I had no alternative except to loyally see that the Resolution of the House of Commons, adopted as it had been by the Government, should be carried into effect. We made an inquiry, and the result was to show that the instructions given by the noble Viscount had not been carried into effect. I was greatly impressed by the fact that Lord Roberts, who naturally felt a great desire that measures should be taken effectively for repressing the disease, came to the conclusion that to a certain extent the instructions had not been followed. That was the state of things which led to the repeal of the regulations. I must confess there was one circumstance which diminished our regret, and it was the uncertainty which certainly existed as to whether the original regulations had been really successful. I do not base that on any view of my own, but upon the best authority which could possibly be quoted on the subject—namely, the Army Sanitary Commission. This Commission is a body with ample means of knowing the state of health of the Army, and is a most competent body to advise on all these subjects. In their memorandum recently laid before Parliament they say:—

> "It may at once be granted that during the years when prostitution in cantonments was to some extent placed under restriction, a lessening of venereal disease amongst the troops did not come up to what had been expected."

And then follows this important sentence:—

> "In fact, we pronounced the efforts to protect the men by the measures introduced for this purpose to have been a failure."

That was what I had before me; and naturally, seeing what had been resolved by Parliament and the extreme hostility shown to the Acts, and having a Report of this kind before me, I felt much less compunction in taking the course which I felt it my duty to take as Secretary of State. But this is not a question of arguing whether the regulations were or were not sufficient for the purpose; what we have before us is the simple fact that there is a frightful amount of disease in the Army, and that it is our absolute duty to take any measures we can devise for diminishing such disease. That is the case before us, and it is not at all profitable to argue as to the statistics of the past except in this way—that we must not shut our eyes to the fact that it is not merely good intentions that are wanted, but that measures effective for the purpose must be devised. ["Hear, hear!"] I cannot help thinking, notwithstanding what we have heard from the medical authorities, that there is a real, substantial, inherent difficulty in really devising these effective measures. We must not be disappointed, therefore, if the steps now taken by the Government should not have all the effect which we should desire. If upon experience that should prove to be the case, I trust we shall not hesitate to take measures still more stringent. [*Cheers.*] This is not a matter which we can afford to trifle with. Differing from those who have conscientiously opposed this measure, I hold the opinion that, not only in the interests of the health of the Army and of the civil population, but even of morality itself, it is our duty to endeavour to diminish this evil, because it cannot be moral to leave a terrible disease to ravage a population upon any principle or pretext whatever if you have any means to repress it. [*Cheers.*] Possibly we may have to adopt means extremely distasteful, and which one would rather not have recourse to; but you have to choose between two things—either to allow the mischief to continue or to adopt whatever measures are found absolutely necessary in order to diminish, though it may not be possible entirely to prevent, it. The facts repel the view that if you take measures to prevent the disease you remove one of the strongest preventives to vice. As a matter of fact, the disease does not prevent the vice, and therefore the argument, even if you admit it, is worth nothing. The most reverend Prelate insisted on the importance of taking every step to improve the morality of the soldier. Every one will cordially concur with the most reverend Prelate; but do not let us shut our eyes to the fact that the history of mankind proves that by no such means will you produce any great or far-reaching effect. I insist upon that, not from any cynical view, but because you must look facts in the face, and it is no use to imagine that you will by any means of that kind really be able to grapple with the problem. Only one word more. I think all who have heard this most interesting Debate, and who hold the opinions which I imagine are generally held here with regard to the necessity for the prevention of this disease, must have seen with great satisfaction the change of feeling which has come across the country upon the subject. It is a matter, I think, of the greatest moment that you will in this respect carry the country heartily with you. [*Cheers.*] If the Government proceed cautiously and wisely, and if the Government of India see that nothing is done beyond the actual necessity of the case, I believe that not only will the country support the Government in the measures which it has now taken, and which I heartily hope may be themselves successful, but also in any further measures which they may find indispensable for the object in view. [*Cheers.*]

*LORD CLARINA, as one of the oldest regimental officers in the House, having had the honour to command a battalion in India as well as in the West Indies, and also one on the home service, felt bound to say a few words. The most reverend Prelate advocated as a means of promoting morality in the Army an increase of married soldiers in a battalion. Presumably the most reverend Prelate would not imagine that if a regiment 1,000 strong were sent to India they could provide them with 1,000 wives and supply transport for a couple of thousand children. [*Laughter.*] Therefore he looked upon that as an impracticable proposition. Supposing, again, 200 soldiers were allowed to marry in each battalion, what would become of the remaining 800? That plan would have no sensible effect in lessening the ravages of disease. He was amazed to hear it suggested that penal results should fall upon a commanding officer in whose regiment there was a large amount of disease. No body of men were more devoted to their duty than the commanding officers of regiments. He commanded two different battalions during his considerable service in India, and he could only say that everything in the power of a commanding officer had not only been done of late during the time Lord Roberts was in command, but that the same anxiety was shown by an equally gallant and able soldier, the late Lord Strathnairn. [*Cheers.*] Having regard to all that was done for the soldier in the way of libraries and the provision of reading-rooms and every sort of game, instruction in trades, and the system of regimental gardens, he was at a loss to know how moral suasion could be carried out more than had been done by officers commanding battalions. He felt convinced, having carefully read over the Dispatch of the Secretary of State, that the measures proposed by the Government would be utterly futile. He agreed with Lord Roberts as to the disease being frequently contracted by the coolie-women employed in carrying out works at the barracks. These women did the work of labourers in England, and it would be a great hardship to prohibit their employment. But there was no reason why they should not be numbered, like the policemen and cabmen in this country. The native policemen attached to the regiment would know the women who misconducted themselves, and with such women compulsory inspection should be enforced. Merely to expel them would be ineffectual, because the men would follow them. It was impossible to prevent soldiers from indulging the strongest instinct of human nature. Here was a terrible scourge which afflicted not only the evil-doer, but a great number of innocent women and children; and to public opinion the evil had been made so thoroughly clear, that he had great hopes the opposition to measures which would stamp out the disease would cease. He only hoped that the clergy would follow the lead of the Primate, who so fully recognised the necessity of dealing with the question, rather than that of the right reverend Prelate to whom the House had listened that evening.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN said that he hoped the Debate might be of great service in having elicited the opinions of the very highest authorities. The Archbishop of Canterbury had commented on the fact that he had not devoted very much time to the moral remedies for the case. He had, indeed, confined himself mainly to the means of satisfying the pressing needs of the case, but he by no means undervalued the effect of moral suasion, and he hoped that everything would be done to distract the minds of the soldiers and improve the moral tone. But, except the superficial matters, human nature changed very slowly, while the ravages of this disease were rapid; and he was deeply impressed with the necessity for taking effective hygienic measures to deal with the pressing necessities of the question. He did not think, judging from the admirable speech of the most reverend Prelate, that, although they might differ as to the relative potency of various remedies, there was any difference of an essential kind between them. Her Majesty's Government did not think such an inquiry as he had asked for would be wise; and therefore he should withdraw his Resolution, though with considerable reluctance. The reasons given by the Under Secretary for India in opposition to the inquiry appeared to him the strongest reasons in favour of the inquiry. The noble Earl had said that information as to the effects of the disease on the native population here could be obtained from women's hospitals, workhouse infirmaries, homes for children, and the churchyards of the country. But such sources of information were not readily available for the great bulk of the public. The noble Earl added that there were five large volumes issued by the Colonial Office, and that the amount of literature on the subject was overwhelming. That was why such an inquiry as he suggested was desirable. The Report of the Departmental Committee was contained in some 30 pages, cost 6½d., contained an immense amount of valuable information, and would be of enormous value in forming public opinion. What he should have liked to see was an inquiry resulting in a similar Report extended over a larger area; and he hoped that would be done some day. Lord Playfair had said that he wished public opinion knew the effect which hygienic measures had in preventing the disease. That was just the hardest thing for the public to learn at present. But as Her Majesty's Government thought that an inquiry might lead to the idea that there should be delay pending its completion, and as they were convinced that the time for action had come, he should withdraw his Resolution, for the last thing he wished to do was to defer effective action. [*Cheers.*]

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUNDS BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS (HOLIDAYS) BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be Read 3ª To-morrow.

RAILWAY ASSESSORS (SCOTLAND) SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be Read 3ª To-morrow.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY (TRANSFER OF PATRONAGE) BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be Read 3ª To-morrow.

House Adjourned at Seven o'Clock, till To-morrow, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Read a Second time.

Mr. D. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) rose to move:—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to divide the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill into two Bills, one comprising the Anstruther, Deal, Hunstanton, and St. Andrew's Pier and Harbour Orders, the other comprising the Killala Pier Order, and to Report them separately to the House."

He said it was exceeding difficult for hon. Members to deal with Provisional Order Bills of this kind which related to so many different places.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. C. T. Ritchie, Croydon) said that it might save the hon. Member's time if he at once stated that he had no objection to the hon. Member's Instruction.

Mr. CRILLY moved his Instruction.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

HERRINGS (IMPORTED).

Sir CHARLES CAMERON (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate (1) whether his attention has been called to the statement that quantities of herrings imported from abroad are being branded as Loch Fyne herrings and sold under that denomination in the Scottish markets; and (2) whether he is aware that, on a complaint that East Coast herrings were being so branded, the Scottish Fishery Board took steps to prevent the fraudulent use of the brand in their case; if so, whether its fraudulent use in the case of foreign herrings can be prevented?

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Graham Murray, Buteshire): I am informed by the Fishery Board that they have communicated with their Officers at the leading fishery stations on the Scottish coasts, including Glasgow, and these officials all report that they have no knowledge of any such practice as that stated in the first part of the hon. Member's Question. I am aware of the case referred to in the second part of the Question.

LETTERS FOR HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that H.M.S. *Algerine*, which left England on 27th February last for the China Station, had, up to the 17th April, received only three mails, one at Gibraltar, one at Malta, and one at Aden, but none at Port Said, none at Suez, and none at Colombo; whether there has been any material departure from the original programme of dates for the arrival at and departure from the various ports of this vessel; and, if not, whether he can explain why the Post Office authorities have failed to dispatch her mails so as to catch her at the ports named; and, whether greater care will be taken to insure the due forwarding of letters for Her Majesty's ships on the various foreign stations so as to ensure their receipt by the crews without unnecessary delay?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The mails for H.M.S. *Algerine* were forwarded strictly in accordance with the information received from the Admiralty. On the 27th and 28th of February the ship's bags were dispatched to Gibraltar; after the 28th of February and up to the 10th of March they were sent to Malta; after the 10th and up to the 19th of March they were sent to Aden, and afterwards to Singapore. No request was made by the Admiralty for mails to be sent to this ship at Port Said, Suez, or Colombo. Every care is taken by the Post Office to ensure the due forwarding of correspondence for Her Majesty's ships. Mails were advisedly not sent to Port Said or Suez for *Algerine*, on account of the doubt of their catching the ship at those ports. Colombo was omitted through a regrettable oversight, which occurred at the Admiralty in making the very large number of alterations in the mail list, which are of daily occurrence, and frequently of considerable intricacy. I understand, however, that complaints of the non-receipt of letters by Her Majesty's ships in all parts of the world, are of rare occurrence.

WATER SUPPLY (LONDON).

MR. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Royal Commission on the Water Supply of London has yet commenced its inquiry; if not, whether he can state what are the reasons for the delay, and when it is expected the inquiry will begin?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): The Royal warrant appointing the Commissioners was received on May 6, but little more than a week ago. The question as to the provision of accommodation for the Commission has not yet been settled, but when the preliminary arrangements are made a meeting of the Committee will be held on an early day.

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give any information as to the details of the Bill for the benefit of the London consumers.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

LONDON WATER SUPPLY.

MR. HARRY SAMUEL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the satisfactory progress in public business, he is now in a position to fix the date when he will introduce the Bill for the benefit of the water consumers of the Metropolis?

MR. CHAPLIN: I have not had an opportunity of discussing the matter with my right hon. Friend the Leader of the House, and I cannot say the exact date when the Bill will be introduced; but it will be introduced shortly.

SUNKEN WRECKS (PLYMOUTH FISHING GROUND).

MR. CHARLES HARRISON (Plymouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the serious loss and damage accruing to the fishing industry from the sunken wrecks on the fishing ground between the Eddystone and Start Point; and whether he will cause such wrecks to be broken up or destroyed, or consult with the Admiralty as to their removal?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): My attention has from time to time been called to the loss and damage caused to the fishing industry from sunken wrecks in the neighbourhood of the Eddystone and Start Point. The Board of Trade have no statutory powers nor any funds at their disposal to enable them to undertake the removal or destruction of such wrecks.

MR. HARRISON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would not consult the Admiralty in order to ascertain whether they could not do something in the matter?

MR. RITCHIE: I do not know what advantage would be derived from our taking that course, because it is quite certain that the Admiralty are no better off than we are in the matter. They have neither power to interfere nor funds to pay the expenses any more than we have.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked whether the expenses might not be defrayed by a grant made from the Trinity House Mercantile Marine Fund?

MR. RITCHIE: I am not sure, but I may point out to the hon. Gentleman that if a Government Department were to take upon themselves the responsibility for clearing the bottom of the sea, and were to draw upon the Mercantile Marine Fund for the expense of doing so, there would not be much of that fund left for other purposes.

BRIGADE OF GUARDS (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Medical Department of the Brigade of Foot Guards is short-handed, and that much difficulty is experienced in filling vacancies in consequence of insecurity of tenure, and the expense of living in London; whether an official application was lately made by the Commanding Officers of the three regiments of Foot Guards for a return to the regimental system; and whether the War Office is prepared to give sympathetic consideration to this request?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): There is at present one vacancy on the Medical Establishment of the Foot Guards. Appointments are made from medical officers who volunteer for the service; and as the appointments are for a fixed term of five years there is no insecurity of tenure. The officers commanding the regiments did recently suggest a return to the old regimental system; but under the existing system no difficulty has hitherto been experienced in finding candidates for the appointments.

LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether memorials signed by all creeds and classes have been received by the Irish Government with reference to the election of a clerk for the Petty Sessions district of Letterbreen, County Fermanagh, requesting, on the ground of public convenience, that it shall be a condition that the successful candidate to be elected on the 21st instant shall be required to reside at or near the Court House, in accordance with the usage of other districts and of the Letterbreen district for the past 60 years; and if he is in a position to say that the prayer of the memorial will be acceded to?

*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Memorials have been received of the nature indicated in the first paragraph, and other memorials have also been received against the appointment of a resident clerk. The Magistrates are fully acquainted with all the regulations bearing on the subject of the election of a clerk, and I must decline at the present stage to state by anticipation what decision the Government may arrive at.

TELEGRAM (NON-DELIVERY).

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that on the morning of 15th March last a telegram was sent from Bangor by Mr. Roberts, of Aber, near Bangor, to a veterinary surgeon, addressed, Rumsey Williams, Carnarvon, requesting his immediate attendance on account of the illness of Mr. Roberts's mare, was not delivered, but was returned to the sender by post the next day, resulting in a delay of 20 hours in the veterinary surgeon's attendance on the mare, which was a valuable shire mare in foal, and died in consequence; whether he is aware that Mr. Rumsey Williams is the only veterinary surgeon of that name in Carnarvon, and, in fact, the only one besides his own assistant; whether, seeing that letters addressed to him in the same terms as the telegram are frequently delivered, he will explain why this telegram was not delivered; and will steps be taken to prevent the recurrence of such inconvenience and loss to the public?

MR. HANBURY: A telegram to the effect stated in the Question was sent on the 15th March by Mr. Roberts, of Aber. The non-delivery of the telegram was brought to the notice of the Postmaster General by Mr. Roberts, who was informed that, although the address of the telegram was strictly not sufficient for the purposes of delivery, the Postmaster General was of opinion that, in view of the nature of the telegram, special efforts should have been made to get it into the hands of the right person. Mr. Rumsey Williams is the only veterinary surgeon of the name in Carnarvon, but the explanation given by the Postmaster for the non-delivery was that there are several persons of the name in Carnarvon, and that in order to avoid difficulty it is necessary that, unless an abbreviated address has been registered, the full address should be given. The opinion of the Postmaster General was duly conveyed to the Postmaster, and regret was expressed to Mr. Roberts.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' FUND (IRELAND).

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any resolution has been received from the Cavan Teachers' Association protesting against the proposals of the Treasury on the subject of the Irish Teachers' Fund; whether the premiums paid by teachers are to be considerably raised, whilst the age for voluntary retirement is to be also raised, thereby lessening the number of claims on the pension fund; whether the first of first class pensions are to be abolished; and, if so, is he aware that it will absolutely deprive a number of first of first class Cavan teachers of the pensions to which they are lawfully entitled, and on getting which they reckoned; and will he make representations to the Treasury or the Education Commissioners suggesting the withdrawal of these proposals?

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Resolutions on this subject have been received. The Report of the Committee and the Treasury Minute have been presented, and will be issued immediately. Meanwhile I may state that the premiums will be raised, but not the age for voluntary retirement. Nor will the first class pensions be abolished in the case of any teachers who now subscribe for them.

LAND COMMISSION.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will ask the Irish Land Commissioners to direct the next Court of Sub-Commissioners that sits for the disposal of cases from the Union of Bawnboy to hold their Court in Ballyconnell, where there is a commodious courthouse in which Quarter Sessions are held, and not put witnesses to the expense and trouble of travelling longer distances to the Court?

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Land Commissioners, as well as the Chairmen of the several Sub-Commissions acting in accordance with the special wishes of the Commissioners, always endeavour to fix the places of hearing of fair rent applications to suit the convenience of all parties concerned, but they cannot, at present, undertake in this instance that the Sub-Commission will sit at Ballyconnell.

Mr. J. C. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether his attention has been called to the latest returns of evictions and eviction notices for the quarter ended 31st March 1897, from which it appears that 109 tenants were turned out of their holdings under Section 7 of the Land Law Act 1887, as against 17 under other processes of law, and 959 tenants dispossessed of all rights in their holdings under the same section; and (2) whether the Government, in view of the agricultural depression under which Ireland is now suffering, and in the light of these returns, will consider the propriety of introducing a short Bill repealing said section of the Act of 1887?

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The number of tenants turned out of their holdings under Section 7 of the Act of 1887 during the quarter ending March 31 last was 95, and the number turned out under other processes of law in this period was 17. The number of tenants converted into caretakers by service of ejectment notices under the seventh section during the same quarter was 959. The tenancy being determined by the service of a notice under this enactment, the tenant must redeem before he can apply to have a fair rent fixed. I believe such redemptions are frequent, though statistics of the actual number are not available, and it is incorrect to assume that the tenant in every such case is ultimately dispossessed of all rights in his holding. Moreover, the tenant may sell the tenancy at any time before the expiration of six months from the service of the notice. I may also point out that, whilst the number of tenants actually evicted in the past quarter was 112, the number of holdings retaken by former tenants in the same period was 158. The reply to the second paragraph is in the negative.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Have the Government any information at their disposal which would show how many of these cases were those of judicial tenants?

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No; I do not think we have, Sir.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Land Commission have in many cases adopted the practice in fair rent applications of having the evidence heard and the holding inspected by only one lay Commissioner; when was this change of practice made, and on what principle the cases in which only one lay Commissioner is to act are selected; whether the practice has arisen because of the want of a sufficient number of lay Commissioners; and whether, in view of the important nature of the interests involved, the Land Commission will in future see that the practice of having an inspection by two lay Commissioners is adhered to?

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Land Commissioners have in several instances delegated to a Sub-Commission, consisting of one legal and one lay assistant Commissioner, the hearing of fair rent cases. This practice has been in existence to a limited extent for many years, and it has been extended during the present year. It has been adopted by the Land Commission for the convenience of the dispatch of public business, and I am informed that the cases have not been specially selected. The Land Commission in their discretion intend to continue the practice.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the third part of my Question—"whether the practice has arisen because of the want of a sufficient number of lay Commissioners?"

*Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I think I have answered that part of the Question. No doubt if you increase the number of lay assistant Commissioners a measure of this kind will be less necessary in the interest of the dispatch of public business.

CIVIL SERVICE (SECOND DIVISION CLERKS).

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in the Second Report of the Ridley Commission (1889) it was recommended that the new entrants to the re-organised Second Division of the Civil Service should be employed upon the lowest class of clerical work; whether the present scale of salaries was founded upon those recommendations; whether, since the issue of that Report, other grades lower than the Second Division and engaged on inferior work have been established; and, if so, whether the character of the duties performed by the Second Division has been accordingly raised; and whether he will grant an inquiry into the nature of the duties of the clerks of the Second Division appointed subsequently to the abovementioned Report under the Order in Council of 21st March 1890?

Mr. HANBURY: The answer to the first paragraph is, Yes; if in clerical work the hon. Member does not include copying. A class of copyists was, of course, contemplated by the Commissioners. The Report of the Commission, it was found, did not provide for a class of work in certain departments of a higher order than copying but not of sufficiently advanced or responsible character to be assigned to clerks of the Second Division, and the class of Statistical Abstractors, who continue the work of the old class of copyists, was created. The result has not been to raise the character of the duties performed by the Second Division. The present scale of the Second Division was fixed subsequently to the Treasury Minute reserving power to appoint abstractors, and in view of its provisions, and in any case all Second Division Clerks entering since that date (10th August 1889) have entered with a knowledge of the conditions of service.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS ACTS.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if the Government will appoint a Select Committee to consider the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts (1882 and 1890) with a view of ascertaining whether any further legislation is desirable and practicable for the more effectual prevention of such explosions?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): We are too far advanced, I am afraid, in the Session to be able to hope that a Committee can do much with the inquiry which the hon. Baronet suggests before its close; but if I saw any indications that an inquiry would be generally welcomed in regard both to this subject and also that of the Bill relating to the persons in charge of engines and boilers, to which the House has given a Second Reading, I should be prepared to favourably consider the proposal.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial from the Midleton (County Cork) Board of Guardians relative to the proposed unequal distribution of the Exchequer grant in aid of the erection of labourers' cottages; and whether he will take steps to comply with the request contained in the memorial?

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Memorials have been received from several Boards of Guardians in reference to the distribution of the Exchequer contribution in aid of the erection of labourers' cottages. I am not prepared to introduce further legislation on the subject. The proposed Amendment was considered by the Government when the Act of last year was under consideration, but was not adopted.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

*MR. HENRY BROADHURST (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can inform the House as to what portions of the building trades would come under the protection of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill; and under what circumstances operatives in the building trade would be excluded from its benefits?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Persons engaged in building works will come under the Bill or not according as steam machinery or the like is or is not used in the construction of the works. The distinction proposed in the Bill is roughly that which exists in the present law between factories and workshops, and further details are, I venture to think, questions for the Committee on the Bill.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of the passing, during the present Session, of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, the Government will undertake to propose legislation on similar lines in next Session with regard to seamen?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Government quite recognise the importance of the Question raised by the right hon. Baronet, but I should be sorry to give any pledge with regard to the legislation we shall propose next Session.

MR. J. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Government will be prepared to extend the Act of 1880 to seamen this Session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir; I do not think we can bring in a second Compensation Bill this Session.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. J. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, with the view of providing an earlier morning delivery at Ballyshannon and Bundoran than 8.30 a.m. and 9 a.m. respectively, and a later dispatch than 4 p.m. and 4.25 p.m. from Bundoran and Ballyshannon respectively, the Post Office Department has yet approached the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland, and with what result; whether the inhabitants of Bundoran, Ballyshannon, and the district lying between Bundoran and Bundoran Junction have repeatedly complained of the inadequate mail service afforded them; and what improved service in the direction indicated in the foregoing paragraph the Department now proposes for the district mentioned?

*Mr. HANBURY: The Great Northern Railway Company has been approached with the object of substituting a train service for the present mail car service from Bundoran Junction to Ballyshannon and Bundoran, 35 miles distant from the Junction. The inhabitants have from time to time complained of the present service, but no improvement in the car service is possible under the existing railway time tables; and it is regretted that the very large sum demanded by the railway company for an early morning train from Bundoran Junction to Bundoran precludes the hope of making the desired improvement by means of the train.

Mr. MACNEILL: Is there no means by representation to the Board of Works or otherwise of bringing the railway company to a sense of reason?

Mr. HANBURY: No; I am afraid there is no method of dealing with the railway company under these circumstances.

Mr. RICHARD M. DANE (Fermanagh, N.): Could the right hon. Gentleman say what offer was made by the Postal authorities to the Great Northern Railway Company?

Mr. HANBURY: No, Sir; it would be contrary to the usual practice to state so.

Mr. MACNEILL: Would the right hon. Gentleman suggest a Royal Commission?

STAMP DUTY (IRELAND).

Mr. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how it happens, while the stamp duty imposed upon conveyances in ordinary cases is computed at 10s. per cent., the duty in land purchase cases is not only 10s. per cent. on the purchase money, but 10s. per cent. also on the value of the unpaid instalments calculated up to the end of the 49 years during which the tenant has to make payments; and can anything be done to mitigate this burden upon small tenant purchasers?

Mr. HANBURY: As my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer explained in reply to a similar Question put to him on the 16th June 1896, the provisions of the Stamp Act to which the hon. Member refers are not confined to Ireland. They apply equally to the sale of any property subject to the payment of money, whether by way of charge or incumbrance or not, and the treatment of land sold subject to repayment of the Land Commission advance is the same as that of land sold subject to an ordinary mortgage. What is bought is more than the tenant's former tenancy; it is a registered freehold title, subject to a terminable charge in favour of the Land Commission.

ORDNANCE SURVEY (MAYO).

Mr. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture (1) if he could state when will the maps of the revised survey of the County of Mayo be all completed and published; (2) of what parts of the County of Mayo will maps be published on the 25-inch scale; (3) whether maps on the 6-inch scale will be also published for the whole county; and (4) will maps of Ireland for the future be in every way brought up to the same standard as the English and Scotch maps?

*The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE (Mr. Walter Long, Liverpool, West Derby): The new 25-inch maps of Mayo will be all completed and published in about two years from now. It is not at present practicable to fix a date for the completion of the revised 6-inch maps. Maps on the 25-inch scale will be published for the whole of the county, with the exception of the moorland in the western part. The reply to the third and fourth Questions is in the affirmative.

CRETE.

Mr. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and, if so, what progress has been effected with the arrangements for the departure of the Turkish troops for Crete?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. Curzon, Lancashire, Southport): For the reasons which I named in the Debate of May 7th, it has not yet been found possible to make any arrangements for the withdrawal of the Turkish troops from Crete, but the question has again been brought forward for discussion by the Powers.

LETTERS (OFFICIAL POSTMARKS).

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the clearly printed postmarks on the letters received in this country from New York and Ottawa, compared with the indistinctly printed postmarks on the majority of letters sent from the leading London post offices; whether he is aware of the existence of the Canadian postmarking machine recently invented, which clearly prints the post town, date, and hour of posting; and whether any, and, if so, what steps are now being taken to improve the postmarking of letters in this country?

Mr. HANBURY: The attention of the Postmaster General has been called to the postmarks in question, and to the postmarking machines which are in use to some extent in the United States and Canada; and he has informed the representative of the proprietors that he is prepared to give the system a trial whenever they are in a position to submit a machine for the purpose.

POST CARDS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that receivers of post cards sent from this country are frequently fined three pence, because the words "Post Card" are written and not printed on the address side; and whether he will instruct our representatives attending the Postal Union Congress at Washington to have the practice relaxed so as to abolish this rule, and also the one which forbids the use of the Royal Arms on post cards sent to our colonies or to foreign countries?

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is aware that receivers of post cards in this country are fined because the words "post card" are written and not printed on the address side; but, judging from the complaints which are received, such cases are comparatively rare. Various proposals in regard to post cards will be discussed at the Postal Congress at Washington, and the British delegates have been instructed to take up a liberal attitude on these proposals as towards the public.

BOARDS OF GUARDIANS (PUBLIC BILLS).

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if it is legal for Boards of Guardians to expend any of their funds in opposing public Bills which are before Parliament; and, if it is the case that the Local Government Board has sanctioned payments by certain Boards of Guardians to the Rating and Assessing Authorities' Defence Association, whose object, as stated in a circular issued under its authority, is to watch all movements connected with any Rating of Machinery Bill, and to take such action as will tend to its defeat in Parliament; and, if so, under what statutory authority has such sanction been given, seeing that in the case of other Boards of Guardians subscribing to the same association the district auditors have disallowed these payments on the ground that they were contrary to law?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am advised that expenditure by a Board of Guardians in opposing a public Bill by which they would be affected would not necessarily be illegal, but all the circumstances, including the nature of the expenditure, would have to be considered before a definite opinion could be expressed as regards any particular case. The Board have, in some instances, sanctioned payments of the kind referred to in the second paragraph of the Question, where application has been made to them for the purpose after the expenditure has been incurred and with a view to obviating a difficulty at the audit. The sanction has been given under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, 1887. They have, however, of late thought it right in giving the sanction to couple with it an intimation that they would not be prepared again to sanction expenditure of this kind.

CHITRAL MEDAL.

Mr. T. R. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War when the Chitral medal will be issued, and what is the cause of the delay?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing): The Chitral medal has been struck and has for some time past been in course of distribution in India. The cause of the delay in its issue was, as I explained in this House on the 2nd of February last, the decision to strike a new medal, instead of adding a clasp to the existing frontier medal which involved the selection and execution of a new design.

DELIVERY OF LETTERS.

Mr. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if rural postmen in Ireland whose duties will be increased by the proposed house to house delivery of letters will have their salaries augmented?

Mr. HANBURY: The case of every rural postman in Ireland, or elsewhere, whose duty is increased by the proposed extension of the free delivery will be considered on its merits. The salaries of these men are regulated by scale in accordance with the work performed.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

Mr. J. LOWLES (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that several railway companies and other large employers of organised and disciplined labour have announced their intention of celebrating Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee by completely removing and cancelling all adverse reports or records of misconduct now existing against individual members of their staffs; and whether he will follow the same course with respect to the Metropolitan Police, many of whom are denied promotion or privileged duty owing to offences committed many years ago?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I was not aware that such was the intention of any of the railway companies or other large employers; but, however that may be, the adoption of a similar course by me in regard to the Metropolitan Police could only, I am afraid, be prejudicial to the welfare both of the public and the force.

Mr. LOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will follow the example set by many large employers of organised and disciplined labour, who have announced their intention of celebrating Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee by cancelling all adverse reports or records of misconduct now existing against individual members of their staffs, by removing all disabilities and hindrances to promotion in every department of the Post Office, consequent upon breaches of discipline or other misconduct on the part of the men, which may have been recorded against them to their prejudice?

Mr. J. L. CAREW (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will consider the advisability of recommending that all records against the postmen of Dublin and other cities be written out and cancelled on the commemoration of the 60th year of Her Majesty's reign?

Mr. HANBURY: I think it will be convenient if I reply to the Questions of the hon. Member for the Haggerston Division of Shoreditch and the hon. Member for the College Green Division of Dublin together. The Postmaster General is not prepared to adopt the suggestions made by the hon. Members. The discipline records in question are preserved in order that the Department may be in possession of the necessary information respecting the conduct and abilities of its servants, to enable it not merely to mete out punishment and rewards, but to see that unfit men are not promoted to positions of trust, and to prevent the grave injustice which would arise if men of good conduct were not to receive the consideration which they deserve. The records are also necessary for pension purposes.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny) asked whether it was not the fact that on the occasion of the Jubilee in 1887 this was done in the case of the Army and police?

Mr. HANBURY: I can only answer for the Post Office. I cannot answer for the Army and the police.

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will say how many sub-postmasters there are on the permanent staff of the Post Office; and whether they will benefit under the improved scheme resulting from the recommendations of the Tweedmouth Committee for Postmasters?

Mr. HANBURY: If by "permanent" the hon. Member means on the establishment and pensionable, there are only about 100 in that position, out of the 19,500 sub-postmasters in the United Kingdom; but they are all "permanent" in the sense that their services can only be dispensed with by the direct decision of the Postmaster General. As a class they do not come under the recommendations of the Tweedmouth Committee relating to head postmasters. There are separate suggestions in the Committee's Report affecting sub-postmasters generally, and these are now under consideration.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state on what grounds the Scotch Office declined to nominate a representative to act on the Committee of Inquiry suggested by the Local Government Board for Ireland regarding the deportation of paupers from Scotland to Ireland?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: There was not any question as to facts. The point is a legal one only, but involving in certain aspects the general question of Poor Law settlement; and the Secretary for Scotland did not think that a Departmental Committee formed as proposed could fairly be invited to pronounce on questions which might affect the whole working of the Poor Law in Scotland.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (AGE CLAUSE).

Mr. ALBERT SPICER (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the strongly expressed opinion of some of Her Majesty's inspectors in recent Reports in favour of raising the leaving age in elementary schools from 11 to 12, could he hold out any hope of passing through Parliament this Session a single Clause Bill to effect the proposed change?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I am not in a position to hold out any hope to the hon. Gentleman that this question will be dealt with in the course of this Session.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON BILL.

Mr. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to re-introduce the University of London Bill this Session; and, if so, when?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: The President of the Council informs me that he hopes to introduce a Bill into the House of Lords shortly. There is some reason to expect that the difficulties which prevented it from passing last year will be removed and certain negotiations are going on with that object. I am unable as yet to speak with any certainty on the subject.

DURATION OF SPEECHES (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

Major RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government will, without unnecessary delay, consider the possibility of introducing such alteration of procedure as would give effect to the sense of the Resolution passed on Tuesday, 11th May, with reference to the duration of speeches in the House of Commons?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: As far as I understood the terms of the Motion which my hon. Friend carried on Tuesday last, it laid down no limit to the length of speeches delivered in the House; but no doubt the result of that decision shows that the general sense of the House is in favour of curtailing the length of speeches, and there will be a very good opportunity to-night and to-morrow—[*laughter*]—of ascertaining how far that evidence will be taken to heart. [*Laughter.*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.), who was received with cheers on his return after indisposition, said: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take the Budget discussion on Thursday next?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: Yes, Sir; I hope to take the Budget discussion on Thursday, but I could not put it down as the first Order. The first Order will be the Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, which I have some reason to hope will not take long.

In reply to Mr. T. M. HEALY,

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he could not give a pledge to take every stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill before proceeding with the Criminal Evidence Bill. He would, however, give as full notice as he could of the time when the later Bill would be brought on again.

In reply to Sir C. DILKE,

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he believed that the Motion he had on the Paper covered the financial part of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill. He should move the suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule tomorrow night, so that the Bill might be got through. It was not his intention to take the finance part of the Bill on Wednesday. He moved:—

"That, whenever the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill is appointed for Tuesday, the House do meet at Three of the clock, and the proceedings on the Bill do have precedence of the Notices of Motions and the other Orders of the Day; and that the said Bill do have precedence on Wednesday, whenever it is appointed for that day."

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said the House might be aware that he had a Motion down with reference to Crown lands as the first Order for To-morrow. He should be glad if To-morrow could be spared for a discussion on a question which had a great interest for Wales.

MR. LEONARD COURTNEY (Bodmin, Cornwall) said he did not rise to criticise or oppose this Motion. He wished merely to ask his right hon. Friend to make some statement as to the Wednesdays after Whitsuntide. There were two or three Bills of private Members which had made progress, and which were now down for days after Whitsuntide. He hoped his right hon. Friend in his Motion did not wish to prevent the possibility of these Bills being dealt with after Whitsuntide.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES pointed out that the greatest interest was taken in Wales with regard to the Welsh Land Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he could not give any specific pledge as to the Wednesdays after Whitsuntide, but he quite recognised that the object of the Standing Order was to give a chance to private Bills which had made some progress in the earlier period of the Session; and that the spirit of the Standing Order had been usually translated by successive Leaders of the House into an arrangement by which two Wednesdays would be given for private Members' Bills. He should be very sorry indeed if it was found necessary to depart from that general precedent.

Motion agreed to.

CREWE (REPRESENTATION).

MR. MACNEILL: I wish to ask you, Sir, whether, having regard to recent occurrences in the Crewe Division of Cheshire, there is any method of enforcing the constitutional obligation of an hon. Member of this House to attend the service of the House and to prevent the practical disfranchisement of the constituency which that hon. Member represents?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I think, Sir—

MR. MACNEILL: Oh! no, no! I asked Mr. Speaker, not you. [*Laughter.*]

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I beg pardon. [*Laughter.*]

*MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware there is any precedent, at least in modern times, for making an order on an individual Member to attend the House, except for the purpose either of giving evidence before a Committee, or attending upon a Committee, or obeying a previous Order of the House or Committee, or to answer for some alleged breach of privilege or order. I say nothing about the power of the House to make such an Order; but I would point out that it would be a very inconvenient course to make motions with regard to individual Members, because it might lead to retaliatory motions from other parts of the House. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"]

MR. MACNEILL: Will the First Lord of the Treasury take any means of enforcing the attendance of the hon. Member for Crewe, so that we may have the benefit of his advice?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I have a much higher opinion of the services rendered by the hon. Member for Crewe than I have of some other Members who have not been present during the whole Session, and I should certainly not take any exceptional measures with regard to any individual Member. [*Cheers.*]

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Wednesday till Wednesday 26th May.

TRUCK ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Thursday 3rd June till Wednesday 30th June.

PENSIONS (OLD AGE) BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Wednesday 26th May till Wednesday 30th June.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L.].

Read the First time; to be read a Second time upon Thursday, and to be printed.—[Bill 255.]

MOTIONS.

SCHOOL BOARDS' EXPENSES.

Bill to provide for expenses incurred by School Boards in relation to School Board Conferences, ordered to be brought in by Sir John Gorst, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Solicitor General; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Thursday, and to be printed.—[Bill 256.]

POOR LAW.

Bill to amend the law with respect to the borrowing of money by Guardians and Managers of District Schools and Asylums, and to explain the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867, ordered to be brought in by Mr. T. W. Russell and Mr. Chaplin; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 257.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

*MR. GEOFFREY DRAGE (Derby) proposed to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add instead thereof the words:—

> "no Bill dealing with accidents to workmen will be satisfactory to this House which does not provide for the prevention of accidents as well as for compensation in case of injury."

He said he was well aware of the gravity of the step he was taking. He had been told by private Friends on both sides of the House that no one would stand any chance of being re-elected by an industrial constituency who opposed the principle of the Bill. But he had always opposed the principle of the Measure as injurious to the best interests of the working classes, and had always advocated the principle of the Amendment which he was now submitting. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean referred on the First Reading to the subject of the Congress of Milan. There, in company with MM. Léon Say and Yves Guyot, he opposed to the best of his ability the principle underlying the Bill, and during his candidature for Parliament he opposed it on all occasions as he had done since he had had the honour of a seat in the House. He must run any risk there might be attaching to opposition to the Bill, even if he stood alone. He would do so in the hope, perhaps a very vain hope, that his opposition would ultimately arouse some Member of more Parliamentary knowledge, and greater knowledge of the subject than himself to support him. He firmly believed that the cause which he supported in the Amendment was good, and would, in the long run, prevail. The objects he had in submitting his Amendment to the House were to show that it was possible to provide for prevention as well as compensation, to show that this was not effected by the Government Bill and, lastly, to show that if the Government Bill was passed it would endanger the very existence of the friendly societies and those institutions of self-help and reliance which it had taken so many years to build up. An alternative policy to that laid before the House by the Government was that contained in the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Morpeth. In that Bill provision was made for the complete abolition of the doctrine of common employment. ["Hear, hear!"] Everyone who had any acquaintance with the subject knew that the operation of the doctrine of common employment, even as limited by the Act of 1880, did bitter injustice every day to the working classes. [*Opposition cheers.*] It was necessary there should be a simplification of procedure. There should, he thought, be a State prosecutor to enforce the law where there was no inspector of mines or factories to do so. Further, in the Government Bill there was no provision for the inclusion of the liability of sub-contractors, there was no provision for increased compensation outside the trades provided for; and, lastly, there was no provision for the better regulation of dangerous and unhealthy trades. According to documents circulated among Members of the House, under the Boilers Explosions Act 1882, of 337 fatal accidents, 232 or 68 per cent. were such as, in the tenour of the Report of the Board of Trade, are preventible. It was quite evident, therefore, that regulations in respect of dangerous and unhealthy trades should be made as would, at any rate, prevent such a state of things as those figures disclosed. Further, the provisions of the alternative Measure he suggested to the House would give full recognition of those friendly societies and mutual societies for which Members on the Ministerial side of the House had always contended. All the specialists whom he had been able to consult since the Bill was introduced had informed him that under the Bill the mutual societies would eventually disappear. He would like to hear from the Home Secretary on what grounds they were to destroy those societies for which they had fought so hard. With regard to the general policy of the Bill, he submitted it was extremely hard to exclude the majority of the trades of the country from what was considered to be justice, until the Government experiment had been tried. In times past the principle of Conservative social legislation had been that protection should be afforded to women and children and the helpless in the first instance, and that adult labour and the well organised labourers should be left to self-help. He suggested that this Bill protected the better organised and richer working men, and left the poorer and weaker men and women and children without protection. He could have wished that in this year of all others when so many people are flocking home from the colonies and foreign countries, they could have found time for discussing a Measure which would do justice to all classes of workers alike. With regard to the question of the prevention of accidents, the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean appealed to him on the First Reading as to the experience in Germany. He found that under the German law, which resembled the Government proposals, there had been an undoubted increase of both serious and trivial accidents, even when every deduction was made for an improved system of notification, and for the fresh industries from time to time brought under the operation of the law. The fact was that, whereas some accidents in Germany might be attributable to the action of the employers, by far the larger number of accidents were attributable to the action of the workmen themselves. There was evidence of increased negligence and malingering on the part of the men. The interval of 13 weeks before which compensation for accident could be claimed in Germany had been called there the high school for simulation. A great American scientific authority, Mr. Graham Brooks, had come to the conclusion that in Germany between 10 to 25 per cent. of the accidents were due to malingering. There were in the House Members who specially represent the working classes, and are closely associated with them. They will be able to say whether or not any malingering is known to trade unions and friendly societies in England; if there were none now he suggested that the Bill of the Government would put a premium upon such conduct, and there was no institution like the visiting committee of friendly societies to check it. In Germany a new race of doctors, who were called cognac doctors, had sprung up, and they made their practice by taking a favourable view of accidents. He would not suggest that such a class of doctors existed in England, or that the workmen in England were malingerers, but he asserted that a Bill such as this would encourage evils of such a kind. Prince Bismarck, who himself carried in Germany similar legislation to this, had since said that such legislation showed an extraordinary psychological ignorance of human nature. Then there were the judicial difficulties with regard to actions for compensation. On the First Reading a well known lawyer, the hon. and learned Member for the Epsom division (Mr. Bucknill) stated that if the Government imagined that by this legislation they would stop litigation they made a great mistake. He (Mr. Drage), on the First Reading showed that, whereas under the German system it was supposed that workmen would obtain a remedy at once, there were last year 38,000 appeals to arbitration committees, 12,000 appeals to Berlin, 2,780 of which were left over from the previous year, so that under this legislation there was all the delay of taxation it was hoped to remove left over from the previous year. He did not like to interrupt the Colonial Secretary when the right hon. Gentleman suggested that the figures were not the most recent, but as a matter of fact, the figures he had received from the courtesy of the head of the Imperial Insurance Office at Berlin were made up to the end of last year, and published in the month of March. In Germany no less than 160,000 decisions had been last year given by local associations in regard to questions of compensation, and he imagined that here there would be applications for compensation in all cases of accident. Let him read what Mr. Graham Brooks, who investigated matters on behalf of America said upon insurance in Germany. That gentleman said:—

> "Almost the most certain thing we can say of these laws is, that they have inspired neither gratitude nor contentment of spirit."

If this Bill were passed they would be able to see whether the numbers increased or not. He now came to the question of expense. The increase of accidents would naturally bring an increase of expense. This last year there had been in England 3,700 fatal, and 47,000 non-fatal accidents. He was informed by those who were more conversant with the question of insurance than he was that premiums would undoubtedly rise many times higher than the figure at which they now stood. There were in that House many large employers of labour who were perfectly capable of answering for themselves as to the immediate effect of such a Measure as this on trade, but there were a large number of small employers in the country who were not represented. It seemed to him that such a class as that would be crushed out. It did seem hard that working men who were struggling to rise in the world should be liable not only for their own negligence and for the negligence of their foremen and the men appointed by them, but also, as they would be under the present Bill, for the negligence and wilful act of the injured man. The result would be that an avenue through which many men had risen to careers of usefulness and fulfilled important positions in the State would be closed to them. As far as he could judge the workmen would have to pay for the whole of the expenditure under this Bill. There were those who were of opinion, and amongst them the late Home Secretary the Member for East Fife, that the money would come out of the workmen's pockets as wage-earners, and there were others who believed that it would come out of their pockets as consumers. If it did not come out of their pockets either as wage-earners or consumers, it would be found by them as taxpayers. His own view was that the highest wages should be paid to a workman straight into his pocket that trade allowed, taking into consideration danger and health; and the Friendly Societies should teach him how to insure himself against negligent conduct for which he himself was responsible. Then there was the question of the administrative side of the Bill. On the First Reading the Colonial Secretary was inclined to flatter the Bill on the ground that it was so short and would be therefore easy to pass. The present Bill was in fact a mere skeleton.

[*Opposition cheers.*] Anyone acquainted with the details of German legislation or any legislation on the subject must be aware that there must be a whole mass of orders arising out of the scheme submitted to the House. ["Hear, hear!"] It was the boast of English legislation of the last century that they passed in that House detailed laws, so that the House of Commons knew how far it was going, and how its provisions would act. He believed that while, as a result of this Bill, the burden of charity will be the same, while the burden of the poor law was not likely to be diminished but to be increased. Under this law the workman would be discouraged from providing for himself as he had done in the past through his friendly society and his trade union, and when out of work would have no club to fall back on. If the Bill should in any way infringe on trade unions, which especially in the north, were largely benevolent in their character, he ventured to think it would be little short of a public calamity. If any hon. Member who held the view that trade unions should be discouraged would look at their figures, he would discover that last year they spent in unemployed benefit £435,000; on sick and accidents benefit, roughly speaking, £250,000; on superannuation benefit, £125,000; and on funeral benefit, £27,000; while their working expenses were £130,000, and among the wealthiest of the old Unions, those connected with mining, iron, engineering, ship-building, and cognate trades, only 6·7 per cent. of their revenue was spent on disputes. He would suggest that anything which diminished in any way that great work or which diminished the inclination of the working men to subscribe to societies which were doing such a magnificent work as that, must be carefully scrutinised before the House gave its assent. [*Opposition cheers.*] If, by the action of that House, these unions were turned away from benevolent objects, all the intelligence and ability which were now occupied in developing and maintaining these funds would be turned in the only direction to which it could find vent—in the direction of disputes. As to the influence which the present legislation was likely to have on friendly societies, he was told by the best authorities he could consult that this Bill would undermine, if it did not eventually destroy, the whole of such societies in this country. He was told that the miners and other mutual societies were bound to go, and that, though the great orders would in some cases in the first instance receive a temporary local benefit, when the old generation which had built up these societies had gone, the younger generation would refuse to join because they could get, as they said, out of the pockets of the employers, what they now had to pay into their own friendly societies. It might interest hon. Members who sat for the Home Counties to know that in the opinion of an official of a friendly society, which was widely spread over the Home Counties, this Bill would be absolutely destructive of the interests with which he was connected and all those interests with which he was acquainted. He was told that this society, which was a very important one, would go to the wall. The friendly societies in England had rendered great services to the country. They had invented the best system of social insurance at a time when commercial insurance was still in its infancy. They had recognised the important fact only now become known abroad, that industrial sickness and accident were one, and cannot be separated. As time went on and an actuarial science advanced, they had made enormous sacrifices in order to place their funds on a sound financial footing; they had united all orders of society in social work, and, during the last ten years, they had made the most extraordinary progress. He was confident that should the friendly societies be left alone in their beneficent work the problem which the Government hoped to meet, in so far as compensation went, by their present Bill, would be met by the working classes out of their own pockets by their own self-reliance and self-help alone. The record of the ten chief orders in this country for the last ten years showed that in round numbers their membership had increased from 1,600,000 to 2,200,000; that their income had increased from £2,500,000 to £3,500,000; that their benefits paid out had increased from £1,600,000 to £2,400,000; and that their accumulated funds had increased from £11,000,000 to £16,700,000. These societies were doing a great work which this Bill would undermine and destroy, and he asked the House whether it was desirable that the efforts of these men should be in any way undermined? These societies had not only solved the most difficult of social problems, but they had taught the working classes a knowledge of business and public affairs which the working classes in no other country possessed. Lastly, they formed a bond by which the whole country was bound together. They had their branches in the Colonies and in the United States, and if on no other ground than that of the bond which they formed with the English-speaking races, he submitted to the House that any Bill which in any way infringed their privileges or diminished their strength should be carefully scrutinised, and if there was any doubt on the matter it should be rejected by the House. There was the question of social peace. They had been told that this Bill would promote social peace, but if there was any argument to be drawn from the experience of Germany it was that it would promote social strife. He had, by the courtesy of the German Imperial Parliament, been furnished with a copy of their last Debates, and he should like to read to the House the statement of the chief representative of the working classes on this subject. Dr. Grillenberger said:—

> "If these laws (the insurance laws) were so constituted as to be suitable for promoting content among the working classes, no incitement would be of any avail to produce discontent. But you see from the facts as they are placed before you to-day that these laws are not in any way calculated to produce content, but precisely amongst those who are, unfortunately obliged to come in contact with these laws the discontent is even greater than it ever was."

In the face of these facts, he thought it was clear that while, as he had shown, the Government Bill would increase accidents, diminish wages, and endanger the friendly societies, it would hold out no prospect of promoting better relations between employer and employed. The fact was that the working classes in England had now before them the choice of Hercules. On the one side there were those who supported the Government, offering them by way of dole what they had hitherto provided for themselves. On the other hand were those, if any there were who agreed with him, who pointed to the hard and thorny path of self-reliance, self-denial, and self-sacrifice, by which the working classes had solved these great social problems in the past, and he for one exhorted the present generation to hand down to their successors, undiminished, the great institution they had inherited. He only hoped the country and the working classes would have time given them to appreciate what was at stake before the Bill was passed. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the interesting speech he recently delivered, summarising the progress of the country in the last 60 years had, he ventured to think, lost sight of a most important factor. He did not take into account the immense advance that had been made during Her Majesty's reign by these self-governing societies, and the great services they had rendered. These societies had made possible, for the first time in the history of the world, the combination between democracy and empire, between liberty and loyalty; and they alone had made the combination possible. In submitting the Motion he had brought before the House, he humbly ventured to ask the House to consider the facts he brought to their notice. He asked them to take into consideration the Bill proposed by the hon. Member for Morpeth as a Bill which would do justice to all classes alike—a Bill which, if passed, would add fresh lustre to the closing years of Her Majesty's reign, as well as to the country they all loved so well.

Sir F. S. POWELL (Wigan) seconded the Amendment.

Mr. EMERSON BAINBRIDGE (Lincoln, Gainsborough) said he had come to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that the Bill now before the House was the most important Measure brought before the Parliament for many years. It was a Measure of such a revolutionary and far-reaching character, that only those who had studied it closely or were largely affected by its provisions were likely to have grasped its real character. The labour a working man could apply with his hands being the only capital he possessed, any enactment which would provide him with the means of maintenance when incapacitated by an accident, or which would give to his family some means of support after his death by accident or otherwise, must appeal to the sympathies and receive the support of every Member of that House if it was based upon proper principles. At first sight this Bill seemed to go a long way in that direction; but he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Colonies when he said that many of the Members who spoke had not "a correct appreciation of the Bill." He wished to support any Measure which would give every working man in this country the assurance that he would be provided for in case of accident, but he believed that this particular Bill was against the best interests of the working classes, would be a death blow to the large and prosperous friendly societies promoted by workmen, would have the effect of throwing a large number of old workmen out of employment, and thus throw a special burden on the rates, would put an unfair burden on employers, and was likely to seriously damage the trade of the country. In summarising the objections to the Bill he had omitted to mention one point which was of great importance, that was the limited area to which it was intended to apply. He thought the Government would find that the concensus of opinion was in favour of making it apply to every workman and every workwoman of every class throughout the Kingdom; and on this point he should just like to say one word as to the agricultural class. The exclusion of this class from the Bill had been upheld by some sections of the Press, on the ground that a small farmer if he had to pay for the death of or injury to one of his workmen would be ruined. He should be able to show later on that this argument would extend to other trades included in the Bill, but there was a complete answer to it. Assuming that the Bill in one form or another became law, it would be the duty of every employer, and especially those who, like the small farmer could not personally bear the brunt of a fatal accident, to insure. If the liabilities under the Bill were reduced, as he should suggest later on, the premium for insurance ought not to be serious, if it were serious that, of course, would be a strong argument against the Bill itself. The special points he wished to mention were:—(1) The effect of the Bill on existing Friendly Societies, and Sick and Accident Funds; (2) The bearing of the proposed high compensation on malingering; (3) The blow which the Bill is likely to strike at one of the most important industries in the Kingdom. With regard to the Friendly Societies, for many years nearly all the trades referred to in the Bill had been supported by these societies, which, managed by the workmen themselves, had kept the men while off work whether from sickness of from accident. It had been said that there was a demand for the Bill, but he was not aware that there was a demand for it in any quarter. It was suggested that the case of Germany was some reason for making a change. He would like to point out that there was a great difference between the law of insurance existing in that country and the law as proposed in this Bill. In Germany the workman during the first 13 weeks of incapacitation from work was supported by a fund, nearly one-half of which was contributed by the workmen themselves, and it was only after the thirteenth week that he was supported either by the State or by the employer. Under this Bill the employer alone would maintain the man after the end of the second week. Very few Members of the House, probably, realised what this meant. He had looked into the figures relating to the large mining districts of Lancashire and Cheshire for the five years ending December 31st, 1896. In that period there were 49,000 cases of relief, and no less than 46,000 of those cases were finished within the 13 weeks. In other words, had the German law prevailed in that district the men would have subscribed in 46,000 cases, or over 90 per cent. of the whole. Coming to the point as to the danger of increasing the duration of the period of incapacitation, the hon. Member said he knew he was touching on a somewhat delicate point; but there was no reason why the real facts, as shown by actual figures, should not be brought before the House. The following figures showed how in the Lancashire and Cheshire country the period of incapacitation distinctly increased according to the rate of relief received. In the Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Permanent Relief Society the amount of relief paid in 1873 was 6s. per week, and the percentage of relieved cases was 12·5. In 1874, with the amount of relief increased to 8s., the percentage rose to 13·5; whilst in 1896, with the relief raised to 10s., the percentage rose to 18·3. The case was further proved by the average period of claim. In 1873-76 the average was 2·8 weeks; in 1877-81 it was 3·0; in 1882-86 it was 3·4; in 1887-91 it was 3·8; and in 1892-96 it was 4·7 weeks. Thus between 1873 and 1896 with a rise in the amount of relief from 6s. to 10s. per week, the average period during which the men received payment rose from 2·8 to 4·7 weeks, an increase of about 70 per cent. It was only natural, it was according to the dictates of human nature, that the nearer the recompense a man received approached to his earnings when at work, the more inclined he was to remain off work. Another important point arose here. Under the present condition of things, when a man was off work from accident he was constantly watched by his fellow workmen and by the visiting committee of his society. Under this Bill there would be no such supervision. The whole burden would fall upon the employer, and there would be nobody to look after the men who were being paid unless detectives were employed for the purpose. One of the most important points he wished to bring before the House was the question of the employment of middle-aged and old men. Most employers desired to keep on their old hands, even if it must be at reduced wages. But what would be the effect of this Bill? It was obvious that when a man got to the age of 50 or 60, he became—either through diminished sight or hearing, or decreased physical force—less able to escape the danger of accident, or when accident befell him he had less recuperative power. Therefore, the tendency would be for the employer to get rid of the older men and fill their places with sound young men. This was a very serious thing, for when they recollected that there were at work in the mines of this country 130,000 men over 45 years of age, they would see that there was a great risk of a large number of these men being thrown out of the mines and coming on the poor rates. All employers had to deal more or less with a very large roving class of workmen, who were nearly always on the move, and who in starting on new premises were much more liable to accident under conditions they were not altogether used to, than men who were permanent workmen. For instance, it was a common thing for a workman who might be a second or third rate man to find employment in a mine, and as a matter of habit, to remain there only a few weeks, and the very fact that he was a second or third rate workman made him more liable to be the victim of an accident. Was it reasonable that an employer under these conditions should be liable for his support for the whole of his life? A further serious objection in the same direction was the fact that exactly the same recompense or remuneration or maintenance payment was made to a man to whom an accident happened, if it was a pure accident, for which no one was responsible, as was made if the accident was one which was due entirely to the man's own carelessness. Was it believed that this Bill was framed for the purpose of meeting a crying need or an urgent demand on the part of the class for whom it was formed? Did the House understand that in the case of nearly all industries with which it proposed to deal, provision was already made for the workmen in case of accidents of every kind? Turning to the case of the mining industry, he said it must be remembered that whilst the working of coal mines was attended with a good deal of risk, there was no industry which had been so watched over by Parliament and so protected with preventive measures in the shape of Mines Regulations Acts and Government inspections, as the mining industry, and in which such excellent societies existed for supporting workmen when sick or disabled. The present condition of the mining industry in relation to the employers' liability and accidents was as follows. Probably half the coal mines in the country belonged to the Miners' Permanent Relief Association, which gave relief in case of all accidents, and in the case of the other half the workmen formed sick and accident clubs from which they got relief in the same way, and to both these the employer subscribed to a smaller or larger degree. This mutual arrangement formed part of the contract between the employer and his workmen. If this Bill had the effect of raising the cost of coal it was quite clear that the employer must pay for this in the first place, and whether the producer or consumer would ultimately carry this on his back would be a question depending on the economic law of supply and demand. His special object was to explain what the cost of the Bill would be on the production of coal. This had been worked out in the district covered by the Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Permanent Relief Society, the members of which produced coal yearly to the extent of 25 million tons, or about one-seventh of the total production of Great Britain. The cost of the effect of this Bill had been carefully computed, and he was able to tell the House that it worked out (taking the maximum rates of remuneration) at 1·64d. per ton on the coal raised, and 1·78d. per ton on the coal sold, but to this must be added an amount for the cost involved in managing the payment of the fund over a certain district, and on the basis of information received from friendly societies, this would increase the cost from 1·78d. to 2·05d. This calculation, however, made no allowance for big explosions, the figures taken, in fact, making no allowance for explosions at all. On the average of the explosions which had taken place the last few years, this would increase the cost to 2·15d. per ton. This was taking the amount payable under the Bill at the maximum amounts, and some reduction should be made in the estimate for this. On the other hand, the estimate was based upon the time of disablement being the same after the passing of the Act as before, but there was no doubt that the average time of disablement would be increased after the passing of such an Act. The increase in one case might be put against the decrease in another, and from that it seems safe to estimate that the cost of coal would be increased 2d. per ton. On the authority, however, of Sir William Lewis, the well-known colliery proprietor of South Wales, he was able to state that this 2d. would in South Wales be increased to no less than 3d. per ton. At first sight this might not appear to hon. Members as a serious amount, but in relation to the average profit made on coal in the United Kingdom it was a very serious matter indeed. On this point he might read to the House an extract from a statement made by a gentleman who was not in the coal trade, but who was the editor of a well-known organ of the coal trade, and who made it his business to ascertain reliable statistics in regard to this industry. This was what he wrote in regard to the Eight Hours' Bill:—

> "It may be safely estimated that the present average profits made on the coal mines of the United Kingdom do not exceed 3d. per ton."

Mr. Jeans' estimate might be taken as being correct; in fact it was confirmed by a statement made a few days ago by one of the largest coal-owners in the County of Durham, and a Member of the other House, who said that if this Bill became law he would have to stop several of his coal pits in that county. Was it just that a tax of this kind should be levied upon the producer, for it was pretty certain that in the first place the producer must bear the burden. The prosperity of this country depended very much upon our ability by cheap production to maintain the export of both coal as a raw material and the finished goods which were manufactured by the aid of coal. Was it likely that any buyer on the Continent of the 40 million tons of coal exported every year would pay one farthing more for his coal in consequence of a new tax being laid upon the producer in this country? It was obvious that he would not. In the counties of Northumberland and Durham alone the sum paid by the miners to the permanent relief fund amounted to over £90,000 a year, and it was quite clear that under this Act the cost would amount to two or three times this amount, say £200,000 a year. It was proposed, without the least consultation with the colliery proprietors, who had launched their capital in this industry, to place the whole of this burden on their shoulders, and it did not seem unreasonable to ask whether this was a fair or just arrangement. But another illustration of the serious effect of this Bill was given by Mr. Blake Walker, President of the Midland Institute of Mining Engineers, in a letter to *The Times* this morning. He related the case of a man being caught in the act of smoking in a dangerous mine, and having been brought before the magistrates, and he wrote on this as follows:—

> "The solicitor who conducted the prosecution pointed out that had an explosion resulted it might have caused the death of 400 of Draper's fellow workmen and the destruction of the pit. The Bench recognised the gravity of the case by sentencing Draper to 21 days' imprisonment. But what I wish to point out

is that if such an accident had resulted, and has involved the awful loss of life which was possible, the liability of the Rother Vale Company under the Home Secretary's Bill would have amounted to from £80,000 to £100,000, which we may assume would mean absolute ruin to 99 collieries out of 100."

What view did the Miners' Unions take of this Bill? They had in the House three hon. Members from the North of England who had worked themselves in mines, and who deservedly held a high position in the eyes both of the men they represented and of the Members of this House. He had no doubt that the mandate they would receive from the Union would be to support the Second Reading of this Bill, for on comparing it with the Bill brought forward by their own representative, the Member for Morpeth, they were in a position to say, that if their own representative's Bill gave them 1s., this Bill gives them 2s. At first sight this was the natural dictate of self-interest, which was common to all; but the representatives he had mentioned were recognised as having a strong sense of justice, and he felt he was quite safe in saying that not one of these gentlemen would rise in their place to contradict his assertion that this Bill was unjust and unfair in its proposal to place the whole burden of all accidents entirely upon the employers' shoulders. It might be considered by some that he had dealt with the Bill too much from an employer's point of view; but he submitted that the best answer to this was to remind the House that another Bill was before the House backed by the names of the hon. Members for Morpeth and others who represented the workmen. From the names on the Bill he took it that it expressed the wishes and desires and requirements of the workmen themselves, and therefore practically represented the wish of the working classes. He was glad to say that this Bill would have his cordial support, meeting as it did many of the objections he had mentioned to the Government Bill. In his short experience in this House he observed that a frequent inquiry made by the Front Bench in meeting dissentient views on any Measure from this side was, "What remedy do you suggest, or what alternative do you propose?" If he had succeeded in laying before the House some real and serious objections to the Bill, he hoped he might have its indulgence while he submitted six points, which, if agreed to by the Government, would, he thought, mitigate substantially the objections which had been raised against the Bill, and would commend it to this House and the country at large as a useful and beneficent Measure:—(1) It should include workpeople of all classes. (2) It should abolish the doctrine of common employment, and make the employer liable to a workman for the negligence of his fellow workmen. (3) It should leave the existing friendly societies and sick and accident societies, which had been and were such an immense benefit to the working classes, and which were for the most part formed and managed by the workmen themselves exactly as they were. (4) It should provide for the maintenance of every workman in the event of any and every accident, whether caused by his own carelessness or not. (5) The average rate of payment should be the same, or thereabouts, as was now paid by the existing friendly societies, which had been perfectly satisfactory to those concerned. And (6) The payment or maintenance rate paid to a workman when incapacitated by accident should be very much less when the accident was due to his own carelessness than what was paid when the man was hurt through the negligence of his fellow workmen, and this payment again should be less than when the accident is caused by the neglect of the employers. If they had an indication from the Government that these points would substantially be conceded in Committee, a large number of the opponents of this Bill would be prepared to support its Second Reading; but if its present provisions were adhered to, he had not the least doubt in his own mind that it would be damaging to the interests of good workmen, would put a premium upon careless and inferior workers, and would be the means of the discharging of a large number of old workmen well able to maintain themselves under the existing conditions of things, and that it would be a serious blow to many of the important industries on which the prosperity of this country depended. He hoped the promoters of the Bill would consider that he had referred to the question in no carping spirit, as he felt sure it was best to give one's opponents credit for bringing a Measure forward with the best of motives. He felt sure that this was so in this particular case; but in his criticism he hoped it would be considered that he had brought forward no paltry or unimportant objections to the Bill.

Mr. S. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow) observed that there were three or four points brought before the House by the hon. Member for Derby with which he entirely agreed. He had always, when the question of employers' liability or compensation had been under consideration, opposed the principle upon which this Bill was based. During the discussion of the Bill of the late Home Secretary in 1893, the Secretary for the Colonies made the remarkable statement that he was in favour of an adequate substitute. For his part, he had always contended that it was impossible to find a monetary substitute and put it against the sacredness of human life, and if he thought, for one moment, that the present Bill, even if the maximum of £300 could be obtained in every case, would risk the loss of one life he would certainly oppose the Second Reading. The hon. Member for Derby said that he could not for the life of him see why the question of prevention could not go along with compensation. As far as he had been able to read the provisions of this somewhat complex Bill, he did not see that it interfered at all with the question of prevention, because he took it that if an employer was guilty of culpable negligence to which one single accident was traceable, criminal responsibility and punishment for that act would be brought in the case of mines under the Coal Mines Regulation Act, in the case of factories under the Factories and Workshops' Act, and in the case of railways under the Railway Acts. Like the hon. Member for Derby, if the Bill of the hon. Member for Morpeth had been under discussion he would have given it his hearty support, but they were not discussing that Measure, which, he regretted, had not had previous discussion. He hoped the House would consider that they were discussing a Measure that affected millions of human beings in this country, and dealing with, probably, one of the most complex questions that could be discussed in the House of Commons. He hoped it would not be discussed from a Party point of view. He did not think it ought to be considered, for one moment, as a Party question, but as one of humanity. He did not look upon this as an Employers' Liability Bill at all. It was not an Employers' Liability Bill; it was a Compensation Bill, and therefore to be viewed somewhat differently to a Bill which would deal both with the criminal and civil responsibility of employers of labour. He should like to give his honest views in regard to the Measure. While the Bill did not rise to the standard of perfection, he believed it went some of the way towards settling this complex question of a responsibility and compensation for accidents. The first weak point was the limited application of the Measure. It excluded seamen, agricultural labourers, men engaged in the building trade, and domestic servants. He contended there was no sound argument which would justify the exclusion of one single trade. If a man in the building trade met with an accident through a scaffold falling, or some defect in the building, surely the dependents of that man were as much entitled to compensation as a miner or a railway servant? Therefore, if he gave his support to the Bill it would be on the distinct understanding that he should co-operate with other hon. Members to secure the inclusion of all trades within the provisions of this important Measure. The hon. Member for Derby pointed out another defect, and that was that the term employer was not sufficiently defined. Supposing an employer had sublet his works to a contractor, and a man met with an accident, who would be the person to sue, and where would the compensation come from? That was a very important consideration. Another weak point in the Bill was in connection with the question of employers insuring individually instead of insuring as a trade. He could quote a case which occurred in 1889 in North Staffordshire, where an accident took place resulting in the loss of 30 or 40 lives. The case was fought in the Courts, the jury awarded compensation, but the employer, not being able to pay it, went into the Bankruptcy Court, both widows and orphans being deprived of their remedy. In the schedule of the Bill the maximum amount of compensation was defined during incapacity for work, but the minimum was not mentioned. One of the strong parts of the Bill was that it included accidents from all trades. The present Employers' Liability Act, it had been stated over and over again, only applied to 12½ per cent. of the persons injured, whilst it had been pointed out that the present Bill would apply to 100 per cent. of the people injured. That was an advantage, if it was correct, and, of course, they should want a pretty accurate definition of what this meant when the Bill got into Committee. There was one point as to which there was considerable doubt, and that was about this question of contracting out. He had always opposed contracting out, and he should oppose it in any Act of Parliament on which the life and health of people depended, because he thought if there was a necessity for an Act passing, it certainly was unfair that provisions should be inserted for contracting out. They were told by the Secretary for the Colonies that this would not be a litigation Bill or a lawyers' relief Bill, because it would destroy the necessity for all litigation in connection with accidents. If that was correct it was a virtuous part of the Bill, but he was rather inclined to believe—and hundreds of others held the same belief—that even under this Bill there would be considerable litigation, and if this was one of the primary objects of the Government he hoped they would make it very clear before the Bill became law. He should be sorry to take the responsibility of being a party to the rejection of this Measure, but at the same time during the Committee stage he, along with other hon. Gentlemen in that House, would do his best to make the Bill as perfect as possible, with the view of relieving poverty and doing away with the distress and almost ruin which occurred in connection with many of the accidents in this country.

*MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens) thought it would be admitted that the Bill contained a new, wide, and very novel principle, and also a principle which had not been asked for by the working men of this country. Before he read the Bill he was, he confessed, favourably impressed by the speeches of the Home Secretary and the Secretary for the Colonies, but he was bound to say that since reading the Bill he had come to the conclusion, without having any intention to oppose its principle, that that principle did involve some very serious objections. He was aware that this was a subject of great complexity and difficulty, the law upon which was now in a very unsatisfactory state, and he, at all events, congratulated the Government on having attempted to deal with it. Those who had sent him to the House were enormously interested in this question, and he, therefore, desired to put some practical objections to the Government. In the first place the Bill seemed to throw far too great a burden on some industries, particularly the coal-mining industry. In the second place it would, in his belief, absolutely kill all existing friendly societies. ["No, no!"] At any rate that was the conclusion he had come to after reading the Bill most carefully, and after considering the facts and figures in the subject. Another objection was that no account seemed to be taken in the Bill of the negligence of the workman himself. For the first time, as he understood the Bill, the employer was to be made liable to a workman injured through his own negligence. His fourth objection was that the Bill would not necessarily decrease litigation. He was in favour of the general principle of compensation contained in the Bill, but he could not agree with the principle of making that compensation take the form of a tax on an industry, for that would amount to taking away with one hand what was given by the other. If a burden was placed on an industry which that industry could not stand, large numbers of men would be thrown out of work, and injury would thus be inflicted on the community. The Bill would throw a serious burden on the coal-mining industry. At the present moment employers were liable for accidents caused by the negligence of themselves, or of persons placed in charge by them; but this Bill made them liable for all accidents, including those arising from the negligence of the workman himself. The principle extended even to inevitable accidents, and inevitable accidents could not be prevented by penalising the employer. The chief argument that had been used was that the industry must be taxed for its victims; but if the industry was unable to bear the tax it would be killed. He submitted that the principle of compensation for inevitable accidents affected the community at large and not the particular industry. Taking the maximum scale of the present Bill, it would impose a burden on the coal-mining industry of 2d. a ton, and to take the example of one colliery alone in his constituency 2d. a ton on the 750,000 tons raised at that particular colliery during the year meant a charge of no less than £6,000 a year. He took the maximum scale because the coal-mining industry was one of the most dangerous, and the wages in it were the highest. He was informed that so far as South-West Lancashire was concerned, this 2d. a ton would make an enormous difference. In the case of small collieries it would have the effect of closing them, and the consequence would be that a large number of men would eventually be thrown out of work, and the injury thus inflicted on the coal-mining industry would largely exceed any benefit that might be obtained under the Bill. Twopence a ton meant 1s. per head of every person employed in the coal-mining industry in the United Kingdom, and would add a burden of £1,600,000 per annum to that industry. He was dealing simply with the question of compensation for accidents to men in the course of their employment. The Bill proposed to give the men the same thing which they had now from other sources, only on a higher scale without their having to pay for it. They would cease to subscribe to their benefit societies because they would know that they would get compensation on a higher scale from their employers without paying anything out of their wages. It might be said that the employers could insure, but he was informed that the rates which the insurance companies would charge would be practically prohibitory. Then with this extra burden thrown on him the employer of labour would be much more particular as to the class of men that he employed. ["Hear, hear!"] He would subject them to a much more rigid examination than was the case at present; and it was obvious that the effect of the Bill would be to prevent a certain class of men getting employment so easily as was now the case. There were only two ways in which a colliery owner could escape from this Bill—reduce the wages or increase the price of coal. He could not reduce the wages without the danger of a strike, and it would be probably equally difficult to raise the price of coal. They knew the importance it was to the glass and many other industries to get their fuel cheap. He put it to the working men's Members to say whether it was likely to increase prevention of accidents if they took away from the men the sense of being careful. He instanced the case of a man who, by lighting a cigarette, endangered the lives of 400 men in a colliery. This showed how important it was to inculcate the duty of care. They all knew how difficult it was to make men careful in the face of dangers to which they were accustomed. The men thought nothing of dangers which caused in others who, like himself, only seldom went down a mine, the liveliest apprehension. In this matter there was a great blot on the Bill. He was not opposed to the principle of the Measure, but he should do his best to amend it. He was not standing there as a colliery proprietor. When he read the Bill he felt inclined to thank Providence that he was not a colliery proprietor. He represented 100 men for one master, and he would sooner lose his seat than support this Bill. The men had not asked for this Bill. The Bill was something entirely new, and he hoped the House would carefully consider it before passing it into law. He did not profess to be an authority on the question. He was entirely in favour of general compensation. By all means let them have a certainty of that, but the question was, who was to pay the compensation? The men were interested in this, and the community were interested in it, and both the men and the community should share the burden of compensation. He knew of the case of the glass industry, where foreign goods were coming in and underselling ours, and the House ought to be careful before throwing these additional burdens on any industry. The burden should be thrown on the shoulders able to bear it. There should be a system of State compensation, so that they should assure that no special burden was put on any particular industry. If the right hon. Gentleman would do that, he should give him his hearty support, and do his best to amend the Bill.

*SIR C. DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said that if he thought that this

Bill would destroy the great benefit societies to which the hon. Member for Derby had alluded—the Manchester Unity, the Foresters, and would harm the trades unions—he should not be found supporting it as he should support it. The hon. Member for Derby had offered no argument in favour of the view that he took. He confessed that his own view was that the trade societies, after this Bill passed, would have as ample ground for existence as they had now. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Derby attacked the Bill upon the ground that it did not contain any safety provisions, but he did not defend his Amendment by a single word. The hon. Member evidently wished to defeat the Bill, and had adopted an Amendment which he thought would conciliate the largest amount of support. He agreed with the hon. Member as to the necessity of safety provisions, but felt that in Committee it was quite open to them to insert such provisions in the Bill. The Bill was not in any way limited by its title. It undoubtedly let in the whole question of employers' liability, and it would be open to hon. Members in Committee to make all the proposals with regard to safety which ought to accompany a Bill of this kind. The hon. Member for Gainsborough and the hon. Member for Derby differed altogether as to who would pay under the Bill. The hon. Member for Gainsborough said the employer would pay the whole cost out of his own pocket, and that the whole profits of coal mining would be destroyed by this legislation. Exactly the same thing was said when the Coal Mines Regulation Act was passed, but the profits of coal mining had not been reduced by one farthing. The hon. Member for Derby said the men would pay, and that not one farthing would come out of the pockets of the employers. That was a somewhat speculative argument. He thought that in the case of the well organised trades the cost would come out of the pockets of the consumers, but that in the case of the ill organised trades there might be some tendency for the cost to come out of wages. The hon. Member for Derby concluded by saying that many of those who, like himself, were opposed to the Bill, were opposed to legislative interference with the rights and habits of grown up men. That was an old view, but time was wholly past for speculative arguments on this question. The first remark he had to make upon the Bill itself was that there was no sort of precedent for it. The nearest approach to it—and even that was very distant—was that similar legislation was now being considered in Belgium. The Belgian Bill and this Bill raised the whole question of individual responsibility as contrasted with trade responsibility, and at once opened up the great difficulties which had been hinted at by the hon. Member for Walthamstow. While he thought the Measure was crudely drawn, he was able to defend it against the strictures of the hon. Member for Derby. There was one question which greatly troubled many men outside the House, namely, that of contracting-out, which was connected with the matter of deductions. When the Bill was introduced it was believed it was intended to preserve or retain in full working order and for the purposes of the Bill existing societies, such as the railway societies; but a perusal of the Bill showed that that was not intended. Those societies, if they were to continue at all, would be entirely outside the Bill. The compensation of those societies could not be used as compensation under the Bill. The deductions to which he was opposed put these societies wholly outside the Measure, and it was probable that the promoters of the societies, if they retained their existence at all, would retain it for wholly different purposes. He knew, indeed, that the great railway companies had been contemplating converting their societies into societies for old-age pensions; but he doubted whether such conversion could take place against the wishes of an unwilling member. Sir R. Palmer had given the opinion that it could not be done against a non-consenting member who had begun to receive benefit. It that was so, the House of Commons would have an opportunity when the railway companies proposed the legislation of considering the footing upon which they intended those societies should exist. It was clear, however, that no question of contracting-out as regarded those societies arose under the present Bill. He admitted that there was something to be said in favour of the extension of the Bill; but with regard to the excluded trades there was the enormous difficulty that they must either continue to limit them very much as proposed in the Bill, or, if they extended them, they would be face to face with the question of bankruptcy. There were some trades, or branches of occupation excluded, which he thought might fairly be put into the Bill in Committee. Coming to the larger exclusions, there was something to be said for the view of the Government that it was difficult to extend the Bill to large sections of those excluded trades. As regarded seamen, the Government had a case, no doubt, for dealing with the matter by separate legislation, because seamen were already the subject of wholly separate legislation. But that excuse, while it availed for the exclusion of seamen from the present Bill, did not avail as regarded the principle of their exclusion, and, if this Bill passed, it seemed to him that the Government, on their own showing and on the lines of the proposals they made, were bound to promise to apply a similar system in a similar Bill next year to seamen. ["Hear, hear!"] As regarded many of the exclusions, there was a great deal to be said, but what was to be said rested upon the question of bankruptcy. Take the case of builders. Even as the Bill stood there was very great danger upon this head. The Bill applied to all building operations which were carried on by builders who employed a steam crane. If they were to follow the analogy of the Factory Act, and its factory accidents notification provision, he thought it ought to be extended even more widely. It ought to be extended to all buildings over 30ft. in height, and having scaffolding. ["Hear, hear!"] But, even as the Bill stood in this respect, the danger of bankruptcy was a very serious one. A pension which might be earned, if one might use the word, by the misfortune of a boy of 15 engaged in the building trade, might run for 60 or 70 years—it might run through three or four generations of building employers. The Bill was not very clear what was to happen in the case of one of those arrangements which were very frequent in the building trade, and which, while not bankruptcies, came somewhat near to that—a sort of handing over the business without a formal bankruptcy. Apart from those difficult cases, in a case of bankruptcy any time within three or four generations of building employers, it seemed to him this pension would cease. They made a show of compensation to a man and then frustrated him in his legitimate expectation by a circumstance which he could not control. It seemed to him that the more they considered this question the more they would be driven to look forward to the ultimate assumption, in some form, of the responsibility of these pensions by some authority higher than the individual himself. [*Cheers.*] Having gone as far as the Government had in this Bill, they undoubtedly would be driven to go further. ["Hear, hear!"] This question of bankruptcy was particularly connected with one which would be the subject of anxious debate in Committee—the consideration of whether the compensation should be by pension or by lump sum. There were difficulties either way, but the Government had not faced those difficulties by putting both principles into their Bill. In the case of Germany there was no lump sum compensation, and weekly pensions had been adopted both for accidents and death. These considerations led him to again say that the task upon which they had entered in this Bill was a larger task than this somewhat crude measure would suggest, and, though he heartily welcomed the House entering upon that task and heartily supported the Bill as an experiment, it could only be looked upon as an experiment which could not end the series of legislation on this question. ["Hear, hear!"] The desire of the Government, no doubt, would be to make the arbitration under the Bill as simple and as cheap as possible, but was it the case that the cost of those proceedings would be low? The Home Secretary, he thought, a little misled the House, though quite involuntarily, in his speech on the introduction of the Bill. The House believed at the time that the cost of the arbitration was to be paid by the community; but when they came to see the Bill they found that that was not the case. The doctor's fee was to be borne by the employer, but the rest of the cost of the proceedings was to be borne by the litigants in the usual way. The fee of the arbitrator was to be paid by the State, but so was the salary of the Judge of the High Court. There was a further point. The County Court Judge was to be arbitrator automatically in many cases, and he wanted to know whether, when he sat as arbitrator, the ordinary fees of County Courts were to be charged or not. This was a matter of very considerable importance to the working classes, because the fees of County Courts were so enormous as to amount to a denial of justice to the poor.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY was understood to say that the fees would not be paid by the parties.

*Sir C. DILKE said he was glad to have that assurance. He assumed that, not only was that the case, but that, when a point of law was referred by an arbitrator to a County Court Judge, the Treasury would renounce the fees and that they would be paid by the Crown. That very greatly mitigated the objection he had to that part of the Bill, and would greatly simplify the litigation under it. ["Hear, hear!"] A great deal of responsibility would rest on the medical man in these cases. He would be the real arbitrator, and, in many cases, it would be his judgment rather than that of the arbitrator which would decide the case. The medical man who had to decide in cases of alleged shamming would have an immense responsibility. Then it was proposed that the medical man should be paid by the employer. Would it not be far better that he should be appointed by the Home Office and paid by the State? ["Hear, hear!"] He raised that question because, although it was a detail, it was a matter that must be settled by the House before it disposed of the money Resolution touching the expenses of carrying out the Bill. He hoped the Government would see their way to make the Bill more popular, even at some increased cost, and to secure a great improvement in its administration by undertaking the appointment of the doctor either for a stated period or for a district, or case by case, and paying him out of the taxes. Upon any other plan they would not only throw enormous responsibility on the medical man, but in many cases would make it most difficult for him to perform his duty, especially if he were a young man dependent on his practice in a district where his patients belonged almost entirely to the two classes affected by the Bill—employers and employed. He hoped the Treasury would be induced to give way on this point, for he was sure that the Home Secretary and his Friends would be only too glad to take the course he had suggested if the Treasury placed no difficulty in the way. There was only one word more he need say with regard to the Bill. A great deal of attention had been called to it outside in the Press, and he thought that something ought to be said by the Government in the course of the Debate as to their intentions with regard to permanent incapacity. The Bill, to his mind, he confessed, seemed clear. It seemed to him that the first clause had no connection with the schedule, but over-rode it altogether, the schedule being merely concerned with machinery. He had asked authorities learned in the law, and they gave him an opposite opinion. They said that the reference in the first clause to the schedule was so drawn, and the schedule itself was so constructed, that the Bill was at least not clear on the question, or was possibly clear in the wrong way; that was to say, that the Bill did not deal with the diminution of capacity. Still a different trade would be a very common case. He hoped that the Government would in the course of the Debate tell the House that they did intend to cover—as the first clause without the schedule appeared to cover—incapacity of every kind; he hoped the Government would assure the House that it was their intention that the Bill should cover every case of incapacity, as he was sure the House would desire it to cover. The Bill was not clear on the point; it had been read in an opposite sense outside, and he hoped the Government would undertake to make it clear. ["Hear, hear!"] The obvious defects which had been pointed out in the course of the Debate ought not, he thought, to deter them from heartily supporting the experiment which this Bill was to make; and if he expressed any doubts as to details of the Bill, they were largely associated with doubts as to whether they ought not even now to go further and boldly carry out a great extension of what was the real principle of the Bill. [*Cheers.*]

*Sir EDWARD HILL (Bristol, S.) said he had long taken a very great interest in the question dealt with by this Bill, feeling, as he did, that it was one of serious importance, not only to the employed but also to the employer. He did not propose to go into details and to give figures in their support. These were matters, he thought, more properly dealt with in the Committee stage. He rejoiced at the Bill of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary, and he felt that he deserved the thanks of the community for the close attention he had given to a very difficult subject. The pleasant feature of the Bill, to his mind, was the recognition of the principle on which alone, in his opinion, this question was to be solved—namely, that of compensation for all accidents, excepting those caused by the wilful action of the workman from intoxication or otherwise. On the Report stage of the Employers' Liability Bill, brought in by the Home Secretary under the late Administration, he ventured to move a series of Amendments which, if they had been carried, would have given the benefits of compensation to all employés, whether the employer were a private individual, a firm, or the State—in Her Majesty's dockyards and arsenals, and even in the Army and Navy; so that no employer should escape liability, and every employé would be certain of compensation. But he was defeated on a Division in which he did not obtain any, or very little, support from the Government side of the House. It seemed to him then, and it seemed to him still, that a Bill which dealt only with a fraction of the accidents to which workmen were liable—namely, those in which negligence could be proved in a Court of Law—was of doubtful benefit to the sufferer. The procedure in Courts of Law was naturally difficult and troublesome, and always expensive. He wished the compensation money to go into the pocket of the injured man, and not into the pocket of the lawyer. It was much better both for employer and employed that there should be a settled sum which would be paid without demur and obtained without difficulty, than that the Courts of Law should be invoked in behalf of an unlimited sum demanded on one side and strenuously resisted on the other. It had been truly said that safety was better than compensation. But he was unable to see how it was possible that an employer's care for his men would be diminished if he had to pay for the whole of the accidents instead of for a portion only of them—that small fraction in which negligence could be proved in a Court of Law. Then it had been said that an employer would relieve himself of liability by insuring. Something had been said on the question of insurance by the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean. Well, he thought insurance should be made compulsory. ["Hear, hear!"] He could not understand why the compensation of the workman should be subjected to the possibility (which he was afraid existed in some instances) of the employer being insolvent at the time when the liability arose. It was said that the Bill would tend to destroy existing societies. Now, he should be sorry if that took place, but he could not see how possibly it could be so. The Bill, relieving the societies from a portion of their liabilities, gave them more power to provide for sickness and old age pensions. He was not in favour of sums of money being paid down, because there was great risk that such sums might be improperly expended or lost, and the sufferer would then cease to enjoy the benefit provided by the Bill. What he hoped would be arranged—and he could see no difficulty —was that the compensation should take the form of inalienable postal annuities, so that, whatever happened, a man would have the benefit provided for him. He was prepared to admit that possibly his own scheme was too comprehensive as well as premature, and he was ready to acknowledge the wisdom of his right hon. Friend in introducing a Bill which dealt with the question tentatively. He had no hesitation whatever in voting for the Bill, hoping that in a short time it would be found that its provisions conferred a great benefit on the working classes of this country, while not putting a too heavy burden on the employers. He hoped that when this was discovered the scope of the Bill would be increased, to the benefit of both classes and to the promotion of that good feeling between them upon which he believed the industrial prosperity of the country depended largely. [*Cheers.*]

*MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he was reminded that night that it was 17 years back that very month that he made his first speech in the House of Commons on the Second Reading of the Employers' Liability Bill of that year. That Bill became law, and it had laid the foundation of every attempt at betterment made since then by successive Governments and private Members. He was bound to say that he viewed with considerable favour the introduction of this the most recent attempt at solving this great problem; and he had great hope of the future of the Bill, not so much for what it contained, except one or two set principles, as for the capacity it possessed to be developed, and the foundation it formed upon which a complete system might be based, which, he believed, might be satisfactory to all classes of the country. ["Hear, hear!"] His first complaint against the Bill was as to its exclusiveness. By the kindness of the Home Secretary that night he was informed that only those portions of the building trade that were in the use of machinery would come under the operations of the Bill. If that was so, at least two-thirds—if not more—of the building trade would be excluded from the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Now, why should 200,000 skilled mechanics and a large number of unskilled labourers be excluded? He was at a loss to understand why; and if the Bill went into Committee he should certainly seek assistance in providing for Amendments that would remove this exclusion of the building trades, from the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] He further thought the Committee would have to consider the advisability of including agricultural labourers within the scope of the Bill. There was seldom a harvest passed in any parish but what there was an accident of some kind to agricultural labourers. The House had behaved exceedingly well to the landlords last year, and he hoped now they had an opportunity of doing an act of kindness to the labourers the Government would embrace it, and include that class in the Bill. Turning to the arbitration scheme of the Bill, he hoped the Government would so safeguard it that men should not be heavily penalised for seeking the protection of a County Court Judge or of some competent authority to be nominated as the arbitrator. He thought if that was done it would facilitate the passing of the Bill through Committee to a very considerable extent. He should also like the Government to see whether they could not make provision for persons who were not totally permanently disabled, but who were partially permanently disabled. A man engaged in the building or engineering trades who lost a leg or an arm would be ruined for the remainder of his life from following his employment, and in such cases it was very seldom that the firms found other employment for the man so injured. He was greatly disappointed in the speech of the hon. Member for Derby. That speech wandered entirely from the purport of the Amendment, which had for its object greater security against accidents. The hon. Member had stated that if the Bill became law it would injure trades unions and must, in some cases, lead to the total destruction of the great friendly societies. For his part, speaking as a forty years member of a trades union, he had not the least fear of such a result. The Bill did not provide out-of-work pay. It did not provide superannuation, and there was no continued assistance of a material kind except there was a severe accident. Surely it could not be said that every member of a trades union, or even a considerable number of them looked forward to receiving injury in order to obtain pensions from the firms by which they were employed. They had heard an extraordinary speech from the hon. Member for Gainsborough. That speech was an exact reproduction of what they heard 17 years back. In the Session of that period an hon. Member who was interested in the coal and cotton industries, and who was also a railway director, speaking from those Benches, declared most solemnly, night after night, that the cotton and coal industries must inevitably be ruined if the Employers' Liability Bill of that year became law, and that, as a consequence of the departure of trade, the railway companies must suffer much depreciation. They knew that those predictions were falsified. They had heard the same doctrine that night from the hon. Member for Gainsborough. For his part he had no belief in anything of the kind happening. The hon. Member had said that the Bill would add two-pence per ton to the cost of the production of coal. It was easy to suggest where some of this cost might come from. The hon. Member for Plymouth had advised him that he intended in the Committee stage to put down such Amendments as would apportion part of this increased charge on the production of coal upon the funds received in the way of royalties, way-leaves, and ground rents, and he would be able to show precedents for that proceeding. He hoped the Secretary for the Colonies would keep on open mind upon that part of the subject, and recognising that these were sources of wealth upon which no extraordinary physical labour was expended, would come to their assistance in seeking to provide that part, at any rate, of this charge should be levied upon the owners of these sources of income. The hon. Member for Gainsborough went on to give six resolutions which he advised the Government to accept and base legislation upon them, but every one of them seemed to be a contradiction of everything he had urged in his speech. He had also told them that if this increased provision was made for workmen during periods of disablement and sickness there would be a strong tendency for them to remain on the sick list for a considerable period, although they were capable of returning to their work. He himself had no faith in the assertion that the true British workman would shirk his work and sham sickness in order to obtain an income from his employer in the way of sick or accident payments. In 1877, when this subject was under the consideration of Parliament, he remembered reading an article—and it was not in a Tory newspaper—in which the writer solemnly described how, if the Bill then under discussion became law, workmen would inevitably commit injuries upon themselves in order to cast a burden upon the employers. He hoped the Government would not listen to any such croakers to-day. Trade and industry had increased by leaps and bounds after every so-called attack upon capital. This was essentially a Bill for Committee. It would not be contested from that side of the House on party lines, but every Member would do his best to assist the Government in improving it. He asked the Government to allow a considerable interval between now and the Committee stage in order that such Amendments as the discussion would have shown to be necessary might be brought in. And if the Government should find it necessary in order to consult all classes interested to postpone the Bill till next year, they need not be ashamed of doing it. The working classes had been attempting to secure legislation for 17 years, and they could easily wait for another six months if necessary. The hon. Member for Morpeth, at the request of the trade unions, had for 22 or 23 years been attempting to abolish the doctrine of common employment, and now those who were strongly opposing the present Measure of the Government would, he understood, willingly support his hon. Friend's Bill. They could not, however, get that Bill, and they were therefore willing to take the Bill they could get. They could not trifle with a Bill that had for its object and aim to give compensation for accidents that would not, under the existing law, be provided for. He himself bore marks on every limb of his body of injuries which he had suffered while working at his trade, and for which, if this Bill had been law, he would have been compensated. He welcomed any honest attempt made in good faith to give greater protection and greater assistance to the workers than they had received in the past. He hoped the suggestions he had made would receive the consideration of the Government, and that they would be prepared to accept Amendments which would greatly broaden and strengthen the Measure.

*MR. ARTHUR STRAUSS (Cornwall, Camborne) thanked the Government on behalf of the Cornish miners for this liberal Bill, which fully realised their most sanguine expectations. Statistics showed that accidents were proportionately far more numerous and far more serious in metalliferous mines than in coal mines. It was heartrending to see the number of men who were blind, or deaf, or cripples in Cornwall. These men had either to obtain a precarious living or to depend on charity, for the provisions made for the Cornish miners were most inadequate. The directors and managers of the mines were also grateful to the Government for bringing in this Bill. They had always been anxious to give ample compensation to men injured in their employment; but, being trustees of the shareholders, they were unable to do so, and this Bill, if passed, would compel them to do that which they had all along desired to do. In this respect they set an example to the colliery owners, for, while the latter would only be affected by the Bill to the extent of 2d. per ton, the Cornish mine-owners would have to pay from 5s. to 10s. a ton additional. The contention that the compensation paid under the Bill would come out of wages was advanced either by lawyers or by hon. Members who were not conversant with trade. He would advise those hon. Members who advanced that theory to go to their constituents and propose that the compensation should be deducted directly, instead of indirectly from their wages, and the hon. Members would then find out what view the working men took of their theory. Nobody who had any practical experience in commerce would assert that because of a small extra charge of this kind, a mine-owner would shut up his mine, and turn his workmen adrift. There was no doubt that compensation would have to be paid by the industry, and the industry alone. It had been argued that the industries of England would be encumbered by this tax, but he would point out that in this country the taxes on industries were far lighter than in any other country in Europe. He congratulated the Government on their ingenuity in picking out the best parts of the German law and discarding the worst parts. About 2¼ millions were annually spent in compensation in Germany, and he had no doubt that there would be a similar expenditure in this country when this Bill passed into law. There were two points in the German law which he would recommend to the consideration of the Government. Instead of a round sum paid as compensation in case of death, pensions were given to the widows and orphans in certain percentages fixed by the law. Then, in the second place, when the bankruptcy of any company was feared, power was given to make application to the Judges for security. The hon. Member for Derby had said that accidents had increased in Germany, but this was not the case. There had been an increase in the number of claims, but this was due to a better knowledge of the law having permeated the working classes of Germany. As a matter of fact, there were less accidents now, as was clearly proved by the death rate. The number of deaths from accidents has gone down from 17 per cent. in 1888 to 9 per cent. at the present time. It had been predicted that there would be more litigation than before. He had made inquiries from a number of Judges in Germany living in those districts in which cases for compensation were particularly likely to occur, and every one said that ever since this law was enforced there had not been a single case in his district of workmen claiming for compensation under the old law. The late Home Secretary told them in 1893 that the average of compensation for injury given in law cases was £42, but in this Bill workmen would get more than £42 on the average. Moreover, the workmen would not go to law if they could help it, but would take what they could get. The hon. Member for Derby had said that there was a great deal of malingering. The insurance authorities of Berlin, however, said that such cases were most rare, because experience had shown that working men themselves condemned malingering, and nobody was better able to find it out than the working man. There had been a few cases in which wrong certificates had been given, but as a matter of fact, when a doctor had been found to have given a wrong certificate his reputation was gone for ever. With regard to the question of appeals, in 1896 9,273 appeals were made to the Berlin Court, that was to say, 23 per cent. of all the cases were entered for appeal. But then the working men could appeal without any_expense whatever, and, therefore, this low percentage showed that there was great content with the decisions. Of these cases 80 per cent. were made by the working men, 18 by the employers, and one per cent by both. Fifty-one per cent of them were for insufficiency of compensation, and the other 49 per cent. for different reasons altogether. At least

71 per cent. of them were rejected, which showed that the awards were satisfactory. As to the question of mines, in his opinion the old and infirm ought not to be employed in mines at all, but if the Government would next Session bring in an Old Age Pension Bill, on as broad and liberal a basis as this Bill, the question of the old and infirm would not arise. Liberal Unionist Members would go back to their constituents with a clear conscience and with the unprecedented record of having fulfilled all the pledges they gave at the general election. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) congratulated the Home Secretary on the reception that had been given to the Bill on both sides of the House, and he entirely agreed with the views that had been expressed favourable to the principle of the Bill. He imagined that they might take it that this Bill was only a step in the direction of extending a similar status to other classes of workmen. Because it would be a most fatal and far-reaching defect in this Bill if they were to make a privileged class of workmen who would be able, without any negligence on the part of the employer, to obtain compensation for themselves while the residue, the majority of the workmen of the country would be deprived of any residue whatever except of the illusory nature afforded by the present Employers Liability Bill. Therefore, he regarded this Bill only as a tentative step in the direction of enabling every workman to obtain compensation for injury by accident who fell within the definition of a workman within the Employer and Workman Act of 1875. But he was bound to say they were undoubtedly introducing a most novel principle in the law of responsibility on the part of employers in making every employer liable to his workman for any injury which might happen to a workman, be it the Act of God or from any other cause beyond his control, and it was certainly a curious fact to be taken in conjunction with the circumstances, that the class of employers upon whom this onerous burden was to be placed were the class of employer in whose employment there were the smallest number of accidents arising from negligence or from want of care. He spoke with some experience, because he had acted in a legal capacity in relation to various branches of the coal trade for some years past, and he could say there was no class of employers more scrupulous in making wise provision against accidents than the coal owners of Durham and Yorkshire. It would have been wise if those responsible for the Bill had brought in the assistance of the State to assist employers financially in their responsibility. He had studied the German system of compensating workmen for accidents, and he entirely differed from the hon. Member who spoke last as to the expense it imposed on the State. It was not the amount of compensation which caused the expense, but the unwieldy character of the machinery for the purpose of fixing and arranging the details of the compensation. But he believed the German system had been found to act most beneficiently in this respect, that it had placed no undue burden on the employer and had secured the absolute certainty of payment to the workman. An explosion in a coal mine often involved the lamentable sacrifice of 100, 200, or 300 lives. The insurance of certain fiery mines would not be effected except at prohibitive rates. He was perfectly certain from what he had heard from coal owners who owned these fiery mines that they would run the racket of them, while insuring against other accidents. If an explosion occurred and 200 or 300 lives were lost in a fiery mine owned by an individual proprietor, or a limited liability company, whose margin of capital was too small to bear the burden of compensation and the proprietor became bankrupt, or the company was wound up the workman would not get compensation. He asked whether it would not be possible to introduce some provision of compensation in the Bill by which a guarantee might be afforded either by Government help or otherwise, that the compensation which would be applicable to these particular cases should be secured to the workman. Take another case. The Bill provided that in the case of a disabled workman the workman was to receive a weekly wage not exceeding 50 per cent. of the wage which he received at the time of the injury. It was to be paid every week by the employer, and supposing the man remained disabled for ten, twenty, or thirty years at every week end the workman would have to apply to his employer if alive, or his administrators or executors if dead, for the payment of this weekly allowance. If an individual employer went bankrupt, or quitted the country and died, and his family could not be followed, what guarantee was there that the unhappy workman would ever get a penny of his compensation? The only rational way of meeting this point was to provide for the capitalisation of that sum whatever it might be. He believed it was the intention of the Government, and certainly of the Colonial Secretary that the procedure under the Bill should be as simple as possible, but the provisions as to settling matters in dispute by arbitration would open the door wide to litigation. In a large number of cases arising under this Act one or other of these contingencies would arise. In every case there would have to be a long arbitration, with counsel, solicitors, agents and witnesses, and then, perhaps, the unhappy workman would find himself compelled to commence *de novo* by an action at law. Could anything be more absurd? As to the provision that no workman was to have any remedy outside the Bill, except in the case of what was called the wilful or wrongful act or default of the employer or of some one for whom he was responsible, he would be glad to know the meaning of those words. Was the workman still to be allowed to bring his action under the Employers' Liability Act if there was negligence on the part of the employer or his agent, or under Lord Campbell's Act if there was negligence on the part of the employer, or was he only to have the remedy of this Bill except in the case of wilful or wrongful act or default? If the Bill meant that it would be a disabling statute. It would rob a certain class of persons of rights which they now had under common law and the Employers' Liability Act. He thought, however, that the Bill contained a very excellent principle, but it was desirable that its benefits should be extended over a wider area, and he thought it would be well if the Government were to consider the representations made in the temperate speech of the hon. Member for Gainsborough, as to the possibility of their availing themselves of the excellent model afforded by the German Statute-book and introducing some system by which compensation might be accorded to workmen by direct intervention of the State. [" Hear, hear! "]

*Mr. AUGUSTUS HELDER (Whitehaven) said he had always been of opinion that there should be compensation for all workmen. Consequently he was very glad to learn that the Government intended to bring in a Bill to carry out that object. He had supposed, however, that the course would have been that which had been adopted for many years, of making the workman contribute to some extent to the funds necessary to find compensation for him, but the fact that the Government had determined to throw all the burden on the employers was a very serious thing for many trades, and might affect them very prejudicially. The remarks that had been made as to the collieries were deserving of much more attention than they had received. It was all very well to say that the employers must pay compensation in all cases of accident, but it would not be so easy for them to carry it out. He should support the Bill, but he thought it would require to be very considerably amended in Committee. The better plan, in his opinion, would have been to have encouraged arrangements between employers and their workmen. This system of universal compensation might also have the effect of stopping public contributions in great accidents. Up to the present, arrangements made between employers and their workmen had been carried out with very beneficial effects; but now workmen, when asked to continue their contributions, would say that it was not necessary to do so. The matter was much more serious than people had any idea of. It was argued that the Bill would not have the effect which he had stated, but the figures put before the House by the Member for Gainsborough showed that it meant an extra charge of 2d. a ton on coal, and that was undoubtedly very serious. Although he would certainly vote for the Bill, he hoped it would be very carefully considered in Committee, and that proper arrangements would be made by which the loss would not be so seriously felt. [" Hear, hear! "]

*Mr. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) said that before entering upon the details of this Bill, he would like to ask the Government, as it would save a considerable amount of time, whether they had an open mind on the question of contracting out? As the Home Secretary remained silent he assumed it was not a convenient moment to make any announcement on the subject. He had had some little experience in connection with contracting out and the Employer's Liability Act. He had, during the time he had been practising as an advocate, dozens of cases, and out of those cases he had selected forty at haphazard and gone through them carefully, and he found that in more than thirty out of these forty cases there was no remedy under the Employers' Liability Act for the injuries received, but there would have been remedy and compensation under the present Bill. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member who opposed the Bill suggesting that the time might come when workmen might, by means of malingering, obtain money for injuries which were not so serious as they represented. From his experience he had never known a case of that kind. It was rather difficult for men to malinger who had their legs, arms, or fingers torn off. He would call their attention to the position in which a workman was placed who received an accident and had to fight it. He regretted to say that from his experience the workman had to fight his case to the bitter end. He had been engaged in these cases for employers, workmen and insurance companies, and he knew what defences were raised when a workman sought compensation. The first defence was that the notice was defective, the second, that the workman knew of the defect in the machinery and had failed to call attention of his employer to it; the third, that it was done by a fellow workman, the fourth, that he was not carrying out the orders of his superior officer; the fifth, that he was engaged in work outside his own employment; the sixth, that his injuries were not so bad as represented; and the seventh and last, that the machinery that caused the accident was not defective. Under the present Bill these defences could not be raised. The only question under it would be, "Are you injured; if so, to what extent?" He was surprised to hear it represented that the coal mining industry was going to be swept off the face of the earth by a paltry tax of 2d. a ton. How long was it since they had to pay shillings extra for their coal owing to the strikes? If they could pay then, they could pay now. The consumer would grumble, but at the same time he would pay. In 12 out of the 30 cases he had mentioned, not one penny was received, either by way of gift or by way of verdict. There was a case of a man killed by a shaft falling upon him. His widow was entitled to £150, but she could not bring the employer in guilty under the Act, and she did not get a farthing. In another case a man had his hand torn off and claimed £100, but he was poor, and unable to find means to pay his fees and he did not get a farthing. There was a third case where a man who fell off a scaffold broke his ribs and legs and claimed £140, but as it was shown that he had assisted in erecting the scaffold he got no verdict, because it was contributory negligence. There was a feeling in this country that the time had come for dealing with this question. He should regard this Bill not as an addition to the Employers' Liability Bill, but as a new departure and an instalment only, because the Government would be compelled, sooner or later, by public opinion to reconstruct the Employers' Liability Act. He believed the Bill would compel every employer to insure, and he did not believe that the insurance companies would refuse the risk of insurance. There was nothing that an insurance company would not take. It was entirely a question of premium. Besides, employers in any particular trade could combine for mutual insurance. He was quite sure that it might be left to the insurance companies to protect themselves by a strict system of inspection. There was one proposal in the Bill to which he strongly objected, and as long as he had breath he should oppose that clause, for if there was one clause in the Bill more objectionable than another, it was the clause which allowed contracting out, and did not provide for supervision of any kind in respect to the administration of the scheme. As long as he had life in his body he should oppose that principle. There was no provision in the Bill either that the workmen affected should have the right of considering the scheme. There was no provision for the workman being heard or that the workman should even receive a copy of the scheme; everything was left to the Registrar of Friendly Societies without his knowing the circumstances. In some of the Friendly Societies' Acts there was provision that workpeople could have an inquiry, but there was nothing of the sort here. With respect to the number of trades with which the Bill dealt, he had no hesitation in saying that it wanted widening, and difficulties would arise, especially in Lancashire cotton mills, as to the meaning of the word "employer." He thought it would be most unreasonable, as well as most dangerous, to give power to the arbitrator to say how money should be invested. The money should be invested in the Post Office Savings Bank, the Government giving, if it was thought necessary, a larger rate of interest than that allowed on ordinary investments. Now, he wanted to call particular attention to a case which would, he thought, have a very material influence on those Members who voted in favour of the contracting out clause when the Bill of 1894 was brought in. If there was one thing which influenced Members three years ago with regard to contracting out more than another, it was the mutual insurance scheme of the London and North Western Railway Company that was dangled before the House. He had investigated the scheme, and had received several letters on the subject, and he was of opinion that if ever there was a good investment and a money-making scheme, it was that of the London and North Western Reailway. In the case of total disablement, a sum not exceeding £1 1s. per week for 52 weeks was paid in weekly instalments, and in the case of death only £50 was paid by the company. Was not that a scandal? The workman had to sign an agreement contracting the company out of all further liability, and giving it the right to dismiss him at a moment's notice without assigning any reason whatever. If they found the rich and powerful London and North Western with such a scheme, what could they expect from the poorer and smaller companies? He felt perfectly satisfied that the railway company, when they agreed to pay £50 in case of a workman's death—

SIR W. HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I think the hon. Member is in error. The sum is £100.

MR. J. BURNS (Battersea): There are two schemes; by one £50 is paid, and by another £100.

*MR. ASCROFT said £50 was paid by the Company and £50 from the fund subscribed by the workmen themselves, but he was under the impression the hon. Baronet the Member for North-West Manchester was not present, and therefore he had not gone so fully into the case. He, however, gave the hon. Baronet notice last week that he intended to make an attack on the London and North Western to condemn their scheme, and to condemn their administration. The scheme provided that the employer should contribute—

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot see how an examination of the scheme of a particular company can be entered upon on the Second Reading of this Bill.

*MR. ASCROFT said his object was to convince those hon. Members who three years ago were in favour of the contracting out clause that contracting out should not be allowed. When the Employers' Liability Bill was before the House, the question whether contracting out was to be allowed was raised. The scheme he was now speaking of was generally cited in favour of allowing contracting out.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is really replying to the arguments used in the case of another Bill upon points which are not raised by this Bill.

*MR. ASCROFT said he would, of course, bow to the Speaker's ruling, but thought that he would have a right to speak on the question of the administration of this fund by the London and North Western to illustrate the objectionable nature of the administration of any scheme. He would, therefore, subject to the Speaker's ruling, explain to the House the manner in which the London and North Western dealt with those servants who dared to make claims of which they disapproved.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see how that arises on this Bill. Of course, the hon. Member is entitled to argue that the present schemes of railway companies are schemes which would or would not be allowed by the Registrar of

Friendly Societies, but that is really the only point which arises in regard to contracting out.

*Mr. ASCROFT said he would not contend further. He simply wanted to show that unless it was fairly administered, any scheme was dangerous. To show it was dangerous he desired to give his experience of the way the largest railway company treated its men. The London and North Western Railway Company's scheme was such a poverty-stricken thing that the company had recourse actually to technical defences when claims were made against it. If contracting out of this Bill were allowed there would be different forms of agreement in different localities, and when a man was injured he would be compelled to go to lawyers to have a construction put upon the particular agreement which he had signed. That would be unsatisfactory, and with a view to limit the expenses, he suggested that a clause should be inserted in the Bill, providing that no solicitor or barrister should conduct a case before an arbitrator. He should vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, but he held himself free to urge the Government in a future Session to extend the operation of the Employers' Liability Bill, to abolish the principle of contracting out, and the doctrine of common employment, and to provide for granting greater compensation.

On the return of Mr. Speaker, after the usual interval,

*Mr. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that, while he sympathised generally with the principle of the Bill, and intended to vote for the Second Reading, he thought that it was a Measure which needed most careful scrutiny in Committee. The Bill seemed to him to bear almost in every line the marks of haste. It was a remarkable fact that this Government should bring forward a great and revolutionary scheme without any preliminary inquiry, despite the fact that both the Government and the public were destitute of information on the subject. Further inquiry would probably have saved the Bill from the crudeness and injustice which marked it in almost every part. The Bill teemed with inconsistencies. For instance, it admitted one industry to the benefits of the Bill and capriciously excluded another. In one case it gave compensation to the workman, although he might have brought the injury on himself, and in other cases it left the employer not liable for an injury which his own selected servant had caused. While it gave compensation for any accident, although no human foresight could have prevented it, on the other hand, it gave no compensation for injury to health or loss of life where the risk might have been obviated by reasonable precautions. The Bill, in short, excluded the very persons who stood most in need of protection. The Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Chamberlain) stated that the Government had excluded small employers, because they were dealing with unavoidable accidents in this Bill, and the small employer was no better able to bear the burden of inevitable misfortune than was the workman. No doubt a large class of accidents were not avoidable. But he should be disposed to say that in countless cases accidents were due to negligence, of which the law—at best a clumsy instrument—could not take cognizance, but which care and oversight on the part of the employer might prevent. If these considerations were well-founded, it must at once occur to hon. Members that they were particularly applicable to cases of small employers, who had their businesses much more directly and immediately under their own eyes, than the larger employers. There was very little reason, therefore, for the exclusion of these small industries from the Bill. It was said by the Colonial Secretary that as far as agriculture was concerned there had been no demand. Yet it was a little curious, if not significant, that within a few hours of that statement being made, a Bill called the Chaffcutters' Bill obtained Second Reading, with the concurrence and approval of the whole House, being carried *nem. con.* What did this show? It showed that the agricultural labourer, and those who represented agricultural labour, were anxious that their industry should be brought within similar rules and regulations to those which applied to factory legislation. He would suggest that if and when the Bill got into Committee, certainly some classes of agricultural operations might be brought within it. ["Hear, hear!"] There was a clause in the Austrian law, which he thought the right hon. Gentleman might very fairly accept as being quite consistent with the general provisions of this Bill, and that would be in effect to include in the Bill any agricultural operation in which machinery driven by steam, water, or other mechanical power was used. ["Hear, hear!"] One word with regard to contracting-out. He did not desire to say much, however, for he believed that in attacking the contracting-out provision of this Bill he would be in effect simply forcing an open door. He gathered that the provision was inserted in the Bill merely to save appearances. The Government were scrupulous on a point of honour—[*cheers*]—remembering that they defeated their opponents' Bill three or four years ago on the question of contracting-out. They had thought themselves bound in honour to introduce a contracting-out clause into this Bill; but he ventured to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that he need not be at all concerned about his consistency, because there was really no analogy between the two cases. It would be quite consistent in the right hon. Gentleman opposite to have stipulated for contracting out in the Bill introduced on that side of the House, and at the same time to have abandoned contracting out in this Bill. He had always held that the case against contracting out, even under the Liberal Bill, was, after fairly balancing the arguments *pro* and *con*, an overwhelmingly strong one. At the same time it could not be denied that a plausible case could have been made out, and was made out, in favour of contracting out of that Bill. But the case was now completely altered. Under that Bill it was proposed to provide by the law for only a fraction of the total number of accidents. There was room, therefore, for schemes outside the law. But now this Bill, which they hoped would become a statute, proposed to cover the whole field of accident, and that being so, what possible room was there for schemes outside the statutory provision? It had been suggested that they were going to have a scheme to which the workmen would be asked to contribute so many pence a week. But it was expressly provided that any scheme substituted for the statutory one must be of at least equal benefit to the workmen. That being so, the Registrar of Friendly Societies would not for a moment entertain any scheme which proposed to take any money out of the pockets of the workmen to form a fund from which compensation was to be taken. Therefore, he said that the contracting-out clause was only inserted for show; and he hoped that the Government would take the advice of their friendly backer, *The Times* newspaper, and drop it. ["Hear, hear!"] Now, with regard to common employment. Most lawyers admitted that it was a bad law, and most laymen contended that it was bad policy. He submitted that it was both bad law and bad policy. He had been under the impression that there was a general agreement in that House with regard to the abolishing of the doctrine of common employment. ["Hear, hear!"] The Royal Commission on Labour, whose Report he had been looking up, assumed that as a result of the Debates in that House in 1893, there was a general agreement in favour of abolishing the doctrine of common employment. If that was so, the case was very much strengthened by this Bill—strengthened, of course, in this way, that as regarded the favoured classes they were practically abolishing the doctrine, and therefore those classes of workmen who were excluded from the Bill would feel that it pressed upon them more harshly and more oppressively than ever when they saw that their fellows were no longer suffering from it. ["Hear, hear!"] One word with regard to the procedure under this Bill. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had very carefully perused Clause 1, sub-section 2, B. As he read it, the clause had this effect—that the workman who thought he had an action against his employer at common law or under the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, could only get into the Common Law Courts to bring his action there through the Committee Room or through the Arbitration Court provided by the Bill. Most distinctly, as the clause was drawn—he did not know whether the Government meant what the draughtsman had put in—but most distinctly, as the clause was drawn, a decision by the Committee or by the Arbitration Court that there had been a wilful and wrongful default on the part of the employer was a condition precedent to bringing an action at common law or under the 1880 Act. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman, or someone else who would speak on the other side, would tell the House what was the real intention of the Bill in this matter; because, if that was to be the meaning of the Bill, it was most monstrous, and would have the strongest possible opposition on that side of the House. [*Opposition cheers.*] Moreover, he was not at all sure, from the way in which the clause was drawn, that criminal liability was not also ruled out in the same way—*i.e.*, you must have the same condition precedent to criminal proceeding. As he had said, the proposal was monstrous, and he could scarcely suppose the Government seriously intended what they had put into the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for the Gainsborough Division, in a speech early in the evening, said that one of the effects of the Bill would be to throw the older miners out of employment. Well, he thought it was not impossible that the Bill might have an effect in that direction. But such a result was not peculiar to this Bill. It had been the effect of most of our recent legislation with regard to labour, viz., to elbow out of employment less competent labour. ["Hear, hear!"] It would seem that that must be the necessary result of the conditions under which our modern labour was carried on. He accepted, therefore, the objection of his hon. Friend. He admitted, because he believed, that that would be in part the result of this Bill. Did he, therefore, oppose it? Not at all, because he believed that the effect could be met in another way. Hon. Members had pointed out the injustice of allowing the whole burden which this Bill created to fall exclusively on the shoulders of the employers, and they said that the State should bear a part of it. No; as far as accidents were concerned, let it fall on the shoulders of the employer. But then came the point at which the State could very properly intervene. It was the duty of the State to make provision for the men who might be thrown out of employment. It was inevitable, under the modern conditions of English labour, upon which the greatness and wealth of the nation depended, that the less competent men should be elbowed out, and that the older men should lose their employment. Then the State ought to take the matter up. The State ought to see that when these veterans of labour, who had borne the burden and the heat of the day, were pushed aside to make way for younger and stronger men—the State ought to see that they were not handed over to the tender mercies of the poorhouse, but that some provision was made for them, so that they who were really sacrifices to the modern conditions of labour should have some provision for spending their declining years in decency and comfort. [*Cheers.*]

*MR. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) claimed that special knowledge entitled him to speak on this most Radical Measure. He represented a mining constituency; he was an employer of miners, and he had suffered in his own person by being incapacitated for several months by a mine accident. He desired to express his approval of the principles of the Bill, but would use no stronger word. He had spoken in his own constituency in favour of a Measure of universal compensation to all workmen, and he was, therefore, very much disappointed indeed to find that the Measure was so meagre in its effect. [*Opposition cheers.*] It certainly largely embraced the class of workmen he represented, and it would therefore to some extent satisfy him. But it would not be such a Measure as might have been expected from this Government—after the many promises its supporters had made to the constituencies. There was no doubt whatever this waa great Bill, and if the Government would only listen to the valuable hints which would be given to them by those who practically understood the matter, it might be made a most valuable Measure. He hoped the Home Secretary would take to heart the hints he had got from supporters as well as from opponents; and in particular that he would include all trades and not attempt the invidious task of selecting certain trades for an employers' liability Bill. He defied the Home Secretary to define the various trades affiliated and embraced in the Bill. He understood the distinction to be that where machinery was employed then the trade affiliated in the schedule would be embraced, but where no machinery was employed, then these should not be classified. In the building trade, for example, the right hon. Gentleman said "It means a large building in which dangerous work is done." That is to say, where a steam crane is employed liability would attach, but where stones were carried up by hand labour the case would be different. In those circumstances many employers would prefer not to employ steam cranes, and yet they knew many fatal accidents had happened from the breaking down of scaffolding. The Bill would affect him, as a colliery-owner, perhaps as largely as any Member of the House, yet he had in his own constituency expressed approval of a Measure which should give compensation to all workmen, but he had always understood they were to have no more litigation. He heard the Secretary of State for the Colonies use the expression that the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, was a lawyers' employment Bill. He was quite sure the present Bill would be to a much greater extent, as it stood, a lawyers' employment Bill. Instead of having two pistols at their head, employers would now have three—the Act of 1880, the common law, and this Bill. [*Laughter.*] He gave his support to the principle of this Bill only on the condition that the whole benefits of the Bill should go to the employés without litigation, and he was certain this Bill did not do so. He was one of the executive of an association of Scottish mine owners formed exclusively for the purpose of an insurance association for employers of mining labour. They managed the whole details themselves. An idea of the extent of their operations might be formed when he stated that during 1894, 1895 and 1896 they had paid over 5¼ millions of money in wages to the miners. The total death and accident claims he did not feel at liberty to state, but the legal expenses were fully two-thirds of the total amount paid in compensation. But what did they now find in this Bill? They found that it vastly enlarged the liability of mine owners, without amending the procedure in connection with the existing law. There was no limit whatever to the time for recovery of compensation, and no notice of death or injury was required, as was provided by Section 4 of the Employers' Liability Act 1880. What would be the consequence of that? No one connected with a colliery could ever have his affairs wound up in the event of death, or dissolution of partnership. Section 1, sub-section (2) stipulated that the employer should not be liable in respect of any injury which did not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages, but it did not preclude him from claiming under the existing law for trifling injuries. Section (1) sub-section (3) would involve an employer in a dilemma. If he pleaded that the Act did not apply and succeeded he might be subjected to the expense of a jury trial. If he pleaded that the Act did apply and succeeded he might be subjected to heavier damages than under the Employers' Liability Act. They had heard a great deal about contracting out, they had no such thing in Scotland. They had no friendly societies in Scotland, because according to opinion of counsel obtained after the passing of the Act of 1880, they were advised that the law of Scotland did not permit of workmen contracting away the legal rights of their wives and children. As far as contracting out was concerned, therefore, their withers were unwrung, but the Government must see to it that this Measure was framed in accordance with the laws of Scotland. With regard to the weekly payment, in the event of incapacity, not exceeding 50 per cent. of the earnings at the time of injury, he considered that such an arrangement was unworkable. As to the weekly wage to be paid in case of incapacity, there was no table whereby the value could be ascertained, neither would ordinary annuity tables apply, as the annuity was contingent on incapacity. It ought to be provided as at present, that the claim for incapacity should be fixed by the arbitrator, as it was by the Sheriff and the Court of Session at present, and then there would be finality; and specially there ought to be a provision that the weekly payments should not exceed in all a specified amount, certainly not more than £150, or three years' wages, whichever should be greater. When the Bill reached the Committee stage he should certainly move a direct Motion against the weekly wage, because he found from his own experience that employés themselves did not wish it, and would much rather have a sum of money paid down or invested for them in an annuity. He had heard hon. Members on both sides, who were not particularly interested, so far as their pocket was concerned, in this Bill, say they would much rather hear of the question of prevention of accidents than compensation. But surely the workmen themselves were the best judges of these matters. He should like to see any hon. Member go down to Crewe and argue against this question of contracting out. He was perfectly sure that no hon. Member could accuse the present Government of doing wrong in maintaining contracting out. He was glad to see that in this Bill they admitted of no compromise whatever on that point, and he should not vote for the Second Reading were contracting out not allowed. The House was too much in the habit of treating working men as children, whereas they were quite able to take care of themselves. It had been said that this question of compensation was not a large question. That, however, was not the case. Competent authorities had said that this liability which was cast upon employers would, in the case of mine owners, certainly involve an extra charge of twopence per ton upon coal, and this in many cases was more than the whole profit. He happened to be a shareholder in one of the most extensive concerns in Scotland, which turned out nearly one-thirtieth of the total output of coal in that country. Last year, this company paid a small dividend of 3 per cent. out of reserve; this year it had paid nothing. Hon. Members talked in an airy manner about the pecuniary responsibility that was thrown upon employers, but so far from its being a light matter, it would mean the extinction of many small concerns. It was no slight sacrifice, for the coal trade at all events, to adopt this Bill. For his part he accepted the principle, and was glad to see that the Home Secretary had undertaken this task. He was only sorry the right hon. Gentleman had not gone so far as he himself was prepared to go, and had not embraced all the trades of this country. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman should ever have undertaken the invidious task of selecting some trades and excluding others. It might be said that the Government had selected those which were most dangerous. But if the others were not dangerous all the less compensation would be needed. He hoped the legislation in this most important, most drastic, most radical, and most revolutionary Measure would not be hastily passed, but that it would receive the most careful consideration. The fashion now seemed to be to see how much output could be got through in a Session, and not what would be the most beneficial. A matter of this importance however, deserved the most careful and painstaking consideration, and he hoped the Home Secretary would give an assurance that he would carefully consider the points he had put before him, and endeavour in Committee to secure Amendments in the direction he had ventured to indicate.

MR. AUGUSTINE BIRRELL (Fife, W.) had hoped to be able to congratulate his hon. Friend who had last spoken upon having intrenched himself in a somewhat stronger position than on the last occasion when he volunteered some remarks. But the hon. Member in the course of his remarks had made the incriminatory admission that he belonged to a company which had violated the criminal law of this country by paying dividends out of capital. [*Laughter.*]

MR. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): I must correct the hon. Member. I said I knew a company which had declared no dividend this year, and which last year took a dividend of 3 per cent. out of capital. I did not say it was my own concern. [*Laughter.*]

MR. BIRRELL said that his hon. Friend had not conveyed to his mind what he meant to do; for the evident suggestion which he was going to make was that the company to which his hon. Friend had referred, like the regiment in which his hon. Friend was interested, ought to be disbanded. [*Laughter.*] His hon. Friend had made a good many references to the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for South-East Essex, and intimated that he thought little of anyone who could not compress his remarks into 20 minutes. If his hon. Friend would look at the clock, he would find that he was not able to compress what he wanted to say into anything like 20 minutes. [*Laughter.*] But he agreed with his hon. Friend that it was a very hard Measure that mine-owners and other employers should have these three pistols held at their heads—the Employers' Liability Act, this proposed Act, and the common law. Representing a constituency where one of the trades favoured by this Bill—the mining industry—was carried on, he was certain of the Bill's favourable reception; but he wished to address the House, not so much as the representative of a mining constituency, as one who belonged to a small and transfigured band of law reformers in the House of Commons. It was as a man who looked forward to nothing better than to earn some slight fame as a reformer of the law—["Hear, hear!" from the ATTORNEY GENERAL]—that he expressed his dismay and regret that in any Bill which had upon its back the name of the Attorney General—[*laughter*]—the opportunity of reforming in some way the common law of the country should have allowed it to go by. It was holding the Legislature up to something like ridicule and contempt deliberately to allow the Home Secretary to frame an entirely new system of law, based upon an entirely novel principle. ["Hear, hear!"] "Come into my parlour," said the Home Secretary,—

> "and you shall there have meted out to you justice on principles very different from those which will be observed if you are foolish enough to go into the Law Courts."

That amounted to a scandal. Such legislation violated the great principle of the House of Commons that there should be for all Her Majesty's subjects equality before the law. [*Cheers.*] The common law of this country was not an irrational law. The law of employers' liability, as understood by the common law, was a branch of the law of negligence; and it proceeded on the footing that no employer should be required to pay a farthing of compensation unless the person injured could prove that the employer had been guilty of a breach of duty, either in commission or in omission to him. On that the whole law of the country was originally based, and though it might not be a sufficient basis, having regard to the enormous increase of our industrial undertakings and to joint-stock companies, yet in its essence and origin it was an entirely satisfactory basis. But it was not allowed to rest there. Satan found mischief still, not only for idle hands, but for subtle and logical brains to do; and Her Majesty's Judges had taken upon themselves not only to interpret contracts between employers and employed, but to invent them, and to introduce terms into the contracts which neither employer nor employed had ever heard of. There was the doctrine of common employment. At one time it was the shibboleth of Party; and no candidate could appear before an industrial constituency without being asked whether he would vote for its abolition. The doctrine was only invented in 1837. Lord Abinger planted it; Baron Alderson watered it; and the devil gave it increase. [*Laughter.*] Working men who had never heard of one another, nor had the faintest relation with one another, were held to be in common employment; and if one was injured by the negligence of the other there was no title to compensation. A platelayer, going home after his day's work, was refused damages when he jumped on to a train and was injured by the gross carelessness of the engine driver, on account of supposed common employment. That doctrine was condemned universally when the Bill of his right hon. Friend was under discussion some years ago. There never was a doctrine which made so poor a show in the House of Commons; though for many years men of conscience and honour had hesitated to pledge themselves to its abolition because they imagined it stood so well. When it was boldly attacked not a single employer rose up to declare that without it he could not carry on his business. Yet this condemned doctrine was allowed to remain a part of the law, and the Home Secretary made it a part of the just and reasonable claim which his scheme had upon the working classes, for if they would fall in with the scheme the doctrine would no longer affect them. Then there was the doctrine of contributory negligence, to which the Colonial Secretary had referred in a feeling, becoming, and instructive manner. It rested upon mediæval ideas about the *causa causans* and the proximate cause of accident; and the Judges declared that on no account must the cause and connection between the negligence of the employer and the injury suffered be severed. This doctrine had stood between the workmen and compensation to the tune of hundreds of thousands of pounds. [" Hear, hear! "] Yet it was a doctrine inconsistent with the general basis of the common law. When, but for the employer's negligence, the accident could not have occurred in stepped the doctrine of proximate cause and connection to do incalculable injustice. Then there was another whole class of cases, governed by that relic of barbaric Latinity—*Volenti non fit injuria*—where a distinction was drawn between *volens* and *sciens*, between the workman who knew he was exposed to danger and the workman who consented to it. And here we had the most highly trained intellects of the country playing fast and loose with men's lives, for no one could draw a line between the man who knew and the man who consented. Judge after Judge had tried to do it, and Judge after Judge had failed. Now it was admitted by this Bill. The great object of the Bill was to put aside that discredited machine, the common law of England, and adopt a law which knew nothing of common employment or contributory negligence or *volenti non fit injuria.* This was not fair upon the law of this country, and the Attorney General ought not to allow such a thing to happen. [*Laughter.*] He looked upon the Attorney General as the guardian of the common law. He ought not to allow a rival judicature to be set up next door to that in which he had made a large fortune and a great reputation—[*laughter*]—but ought to see that the admitted abuses of the common law were altered so that all Her Majesty's subjects should have fair play in this matter. He did not say whether in an experimental measure it might not be wise to begin with certain trades; but the effect of the Bill was that for certain trades all these admitted abuses had ceased, while for every other occupation of the country the horrors of the law remained unreformed. [" Hear, hear! " *and laughter.*] To depart from the law based on negligence was a most solemn change. They were departing from the law that nobody should pay unless he was to blame; and were saying that short of suicide—for he did not suppose that was within the scope of the Bill—[*cries of* " Yes! "]—all damage that resulted from the careless, wanton action of the workmen was to be heaped on the head of the employer. That was based on a new principle, namely, that the employer of labour should guarantee and insure the lives of all the persons he invited to join his employment from all accidents whatsoever. He believed that was a just and a proper thing. All the enterprise of this country was carried on by the joint efforts of labour and capital. The capitalist at the most only risked his money. The employé contributed his bones and sinews and risked his life. In case the enterprise turned out a success the capitalist made a fortune; whereas, however, successful the concern might be the workman got out of it just sufficient in the form of wage to maintain himself and bring up his family to lead a life of equally arduous and strenuous toil as that which had bent his own back and shortened his days. It was, therefore, perfectly just and right that the House should in these latter days depart altogether from the old common law ideas of negligence and impose upon every employer the responsibility of insuring the lives of his workmen without entering into the question of how the accident was brought about. But, as a law reformer, he would ask, Why should they expose the Courts of Her Majesty to ridicule and contempt? Why should they allow the Judges to go on administering a law which the Bill emphatically condemned? [" Hear, hear! "]

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): This is a most interesting discussion to lawyers, and I only regret, for my own sake, and still more for that of the House of Commons, that it should fall to my lot to be sponsor for the Bill, and that it is not introduced directly under the auspices of my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General. I can assure my hon. and learned Friend opposite that I am fully conscious of my inability to do justice, from a legal point of view, to this new departure in our procedure. I am at the same time very glad that, notwithstanding the fact that the Bill is a new and startling departure, its principle has his approval, and that, although he believes that in a more legal and constitutional way the doctrines of contributory negligence, common employment, and *volenti non fit injuria*, might have been abrogated, still, that so far as it goes, our Measure has his support. I think the Government has no reason to complain of the reception with which the Bill has met. I recognise that from every quarter of the House, whether the matter is looked at from the point of view of the employers or from the point of view of the men and the trade unions, this Bill has received nothing but fair criticism—if candid criticism—during the two evenings' Debate on its provisions; and whatever may be the ultimate fate of the Measure, we may take this consolation to heart, that if the principal complaint against it be, as it undoubtedly is, that we have not included all the industries of the country within its operation, it cannot be such a very bad Bill after all. ["Hear, hear!"] With regard to the Amendment which has been moved by the hon. Member for Derby, I do not know whether he seriously intends to propose that the Bill should be accompanied by some measure of prevention. I imagine that if employers become their own insurers, they will have every inducement to take care that there are no accidents; and it is equally certain that if insurance societies are the insurer, they will take care that the premiums are low in the interest of the employers by whom the best precautions against accident are taken. ["Hear, hear!"] From what I have been able to gather from a study of the question, I do not believe it is accurate to say that in consequence of this insurance in Germany there has been an increase in accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] Certainly as regards fatal accidents the figures show, not an increase, but a decided decrease. My hon. Friend asks that there should be further legislation with a view to securing prevention in dangerous trades. As to that, I think I may say that neither my right hon. Friend opposite, the late Home Secretary, nor, in an humble capacity, myself, have failed to do something to secure prevention against dangerous accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] My right hon. Friend's Factory Act was a great piece of legislation—["hear, hear!"]—and from the time it was passed into law there have been inquiries going on which are rapidly introducing into our most dangerous trades regulations that are best calculated to insure both life and health. ["Hear, hear!"] And having, with the assistance of the House, passed the Coal Mines Act of last year, I think it is not true to say that the House of Commons is unwilling to pass legislation for further strengthening the law which regulates our dangerous industries, and I am confident that, if the responsible Minister thinks it necessary to ask the House for further powers in the same direction, the House will not be unwilling to recognise his demand. ["Hear, hear!"] I now come to the two most important arguments urged against the Bill. The first is that it does not abolish common employment in all industries. My answer is that it does abolish it completely and practically, if indirectly, where it applies. I say, further, that, in developing this new departure, it adopts a better principle in giving the workman, instead of a claim for an unlimited amount, an immediate and direct, though limited, compensation. ["Hear, hear!"] I am confident that if we had introduced into this Bill proposals to abolish common employment in regard to other industries we should have immensely complicated the Measure. ["Hear, hear!"] If my hon. and learned Friend will draw up, as an Amendment, those three or four clauses, which he says can be prepared so easily, embodying the abolition of common employment in respect to those industries which may not be included in the Bill, I am willing to give it favourable consideration. But I am persuaded that if you now raise the question of the abolition of common employment for all industries—including domestic service and employment at sea—you will raise controversies that will materially interfere with the passing of this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] I come now to the great question of the limitation of the Bill. We have followed in this matter the precedent of other countries. On the Continent this law has been applied gradually. I should like to say that the distinction we have made in this Bill is not an arbitrary one. We have got, I think, some general recognition of the fact that in applying this new principle we were bound to proceed in a tentative fashion, with caution, and in the hope that it might win favour and lead to the introduction of what we believe will be a great boon to the working classes of this country and to other classes not included at the present moment. We have applied this principle in the first place where there are most accidents. That may not be a logical thing to do, but it is a practical thing to do. It certainly is no satisfaction to a man working in an excluded employment to know that he is not able to get the same compensation which a workman is entitled to who comes under this Bill, but at least when you are legislating for millions of people it is reasonable to legislate for those trades in which you know by figures that you have most accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] Every trade which may fairly be called dangerous is included, except that of seamen. Moreover, the trades included are those which are, as a rule, carried on on a scale which will enable those who are responsible for them to pay compensation by their own insurance. I should like to say something as to the number of those who appear to me to be included in the Bill. I take the number of workmen in factories, docks, and wharves as 3,600,000; in mines, 730,000; on railways, 465,000; and in quarries, 104,000. As to the remaining class included—namely, those employed in engineering works—I find it extremely difficult to ascertain the number. There are a great many builders and bricklayers, something like 700,000; and under the description of general labourers and navvies another 800,000 might fairly come. At all events, there will be included in this Bill as at present drawn some 6,000,000 at least of the workmen of this country. [*Cheers.*] Outside the Bill there are those employed in agriculture, whom I estimate at 1,700,000; seamen and fishermen, about 192,000; domestic servants, 2,300,000; persons employed in workshops I roughly estimate at 2,000,000; shop assistants, 500,000; transport services, 600,000—which give a total of something over 7,000,000. I am not at all surprised that many of my hon. Friends would like to see agriculture included, because, unfortunately, where machinery is used those employed in agriculture are liable to the same kind of accidents as those which occur in a factory. But if you consider the few statistics that we have in connection with agriculture, and the number of farm servants who may be classified as domestic servants, you will recognise how great has been our difficulty. The small farmer, moreover, is not as a rule a man who is inclined to insure. Therefore I think we ought not to be in a hurry in this respect, although I am not at all unfriendly to the representations which are made. With reference to seamen, although theirs is a very dangerous industry, I would point out that it is under special laws, and I do not consider that anybody could bring them under this Bill. Under the shipping laws, when accidents happen to seamen in the course of their employment they are entitled to maintenance after the accident, and also to their wages, unless the accident is caused by their own fault. It has never been the practice to bring seamen under such a Bill as this, and I think there is sufficient reason for excluding them. The Government, however, are not indisposed to listen to arguments which may be brought forward. ["Hear, hear!"] As to the question of workshops, it has been said that there may be very little difference between a workshop and a factory, but there is a real and substantial difference, not only in regard to the machinery, but in the actual results as tested by the number of accidents. This year is the first in which we have had a return of the number of accidents in workshops as distinguished from factories, and I find that, whereas there have been in the first three months only two fatal and 34 non-fatal accidents in workshops, there have been 188 fatal and 9,247 non-fatal accidents in factories, the number of workpeople being, respectively, 2,000,000 in workshops and 3,500,000 in factories. In separating workshops from factories for the purposes of this Bill, therefore, we have clearly shown that we are taking those trades in which there are the greater number of accidents. With reference to the question of contracting out, my hon. Friend the Member for Oldham asked me whether the Government had an open mind upon that question. All I can say is that we have thought ourselves bound by our own convictions, and by the pledges which we gave when this question was formerly discussed in the House, to enable the parties, both workmen and employers, to make their own contracts if they so please. ["Hear, hear!"] We have thought that where proper they should do so, provided the terms they made were at least as favourable to the workmen as those contained in the Bill. We have not overlooked the fact in proposing a Bill which confers such a great boon upon the workmen that there may be less incentive to him to join a mutual insurance society, or that the employer, when called upon to bear so much larger a liability, may not be disposed to open his pocket to a great extent; but we do believe that there is yet room for the action of these societies in the case of accidents for which compensation is not paid, or in the case of sickness. I wish to say emphatically that the clause in regard to this matter is so drawn that the Registrar of Friendly Societies, who has an intimate knowledge of the practice of all friendly societies, and who has, I believe, their good will, should be able to take into consideration all the circumstances in regard to these mutual insurance societies. If the workman comes under contribution to the insurance societies we must see that he gets a *quid pro quo* beyond what he gets by the liability of the employer under this Bill. Therefore, I think the House will not be astonished that we have thought it our duty to introduce this clause. We believe there is no danger in it, that it is perfectly reasonable, and that if employers and workmen, notwithstanding the great boon given to the workmen under this Bill, can see their way to arrange for the same boon to be given in a slightly different way, they ought to be at liberty to do so. The right hon. Gentleman opposite says we have abandoned freedom of contract. There is no such thing as freedom of contract in this country or any other. We make our own arrangements as regards houses or farms under the conditions of the law, which lays down certain conditions with which you must comply; and this Bill lays down certain conditions with which employers and workmen must comply. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean talked about the difficulties of the Bill from the point of view of the bankruptcy of the employer, considering that we have adopted the principle of individual and not trade responsibility. I am not indisposed to admit the risk this proposal incurs. It would be an advantage to amend the Bill so as to give security to the workman for the recovery of compensation due under the Bill, whether from a private owner, large or small, or a limited company. [*Cheers.*] But the right hon. Gentleman hardly expected that the Government could have proposed any scheme of compulsory trade responsibility or insurance. Anyone who has studied the details of the German system will feel that it could never be introduced into this country; and when you look at the enormous expense which that system entails—one-fifth of the total amount of compensation, and in case of mines one-tenth—I am sure it will be felt it would not do here. We hope that by such associations of employers as have been spoken of, and mutual arrangements between cognate trades and industries, employers responsible under the Bill will protect themselves against their liability; and such arrangements made voluntarily, as is the custom in this country, will be far more effective and economical and in accordance with English feeling than any compulsory system. As to litigation, many hon. Members think the Bill will not realise our intention—that litigation should be reduced as far as possible, and that as simple a method of procedure should be found as is consistent with getting ready and speedy justice. Our hope is that boards of employers and workmen will be formed who will be able to come to an agreement. If not, we have thought it best to provide arbitrators. The cost of the arbitrators is not to fall on the parties, nor the fees of the County Court Judge, but to provide counsel to be paid on either side by the State is to ask for more than we can grant. The hon. Member for Derby spoke of the number and cost of appeals under the German system. But appeals in Germany are very different from what they would be under this Bill. In Germany the first compensation is assessed to the workman by an association composed entirely of employers, from whom goes the first appeal to a board composed in certain proportion of employers and workmen. Then there is a further appeal to the High Court of Berlin. There have been many appeals under the German law, and they are increasing in number. But surely no argument can be drawn from that that there will be an increase of litigation under this Bill, because we provide no system similar. As to malingering, the Bill provides that there will be no payment for the first two weeks. In Germany there is no payment for the first 13 weeks, except under the sick insurance, to which both parties contribute. But, by providing proper precautions and seeing there is a proper medical officer, and relying on the action of friendly societies, who may be in many cases giving extra help, we do not fear any increase of malingering, which is not common in Great Britain. I do not believe there has been any increase of bad feeling between workman and employer in Germany; as far as I have studied the report of the American Commission on Labour I understand they came to a similar conclusion. Nothing has been said to-night, or very little, upon the scale we adopt in the schedule. I think it is not a scale which is open to attack on the score of liberality. ["Hear, hear!"] If more is wanted, I think it ought to be provided from other sources. I believe, generally, when we come to the question in Committee that it will be felt that, on the whole, when we impose this universal liability the scale proposed in the Bill is not inadequate. I admit that there are objections to some of the provisions, and that there are details that require to be amended. You may argue in favour of a pension for a considerable number of years, or in favour of a payment down. You may argue in favour of a pension because in many cases it would be easier for the employer to pay; and you may argue for the payment of a fixed sum down because if paid it is paid once for all, and it can be, possibly, recovered from an association or company which could not be depended on for payment in the case of a pension for a considerable number of years. These are details, as also the question of partial incapacity, and questions of that sort, about which the Government are perfectly ready to consider any suggestions that may be made to them. ["Hear, hear!"] On the question of cost, we have heard two or three conflicting speeches to-night. I am fully sensible, and I am sure the Government are also, that if, upon consideration, it turns out that the conditions of the Bill are likely to be onerous to the trade of the country, they ought not to be imposed. I have taken the coal-mining industry as the principal industry that will be affected—["hear, hear!"]—and I have worked out what would be the percentage of compensation to the wages paid in this country. I was astonished at the figures given to-night by the hon. Gentleman opposite. He said that the advice given to him, and his own knowledge led him to the conclusion that the liability under this Bill will impose on the general coal trade of Great Britain an extra charge of 2d. a ton. If that be so, I admit that it is a serious charge. ["Hear, hear!"] But my figures point in another direction. I have worked the thing out from two points of view. First of all, I have taken the German experience. I have taken the number of German accidents, I have allowed for different conditions and circumstances, I have allowed for the 13 weeks under the German system and the two weeks under ours, I have allowed for the higher scale in Germany, which is roughly as four to our three, and the extra risk, and I have found that the percentage of compensation paid to the wages in any one year would be just a little over one per cent. I do not say that these figures are of any great value, but I have checked them with the figures for Great Britain; and when I come to work out the figures for Great Britain I find the result comes to something near the same figure. I have taken the number of deaths from 1891 to 1895, which gives a yearly average of 1,046. I have used the figures of the Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Relief Society as typical of the rest of England, and I have found them corroborated by the figures of Northumberland and Durham.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): We make out the figure in Northumberland at 1d.

*Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: My figures are taken for the whole of Great Britain. I admit that one district may be different from another and the risk may be different; but I use these figures for the purpose of ascertaining the number of men who would leave widows and whose widows and children would have to be paid under the scale in this Bill, and the number of men killed whose funeral expenses would have to be paid, and with a further computation for non-fatal accidents, I have arrived at exactly the same result as is obtained from the German figures. Taking the total wages at £39,000,000, the total payments in one year would be about £500,000, and that gives a percentage of about 1·2; and if I take the output of coal at 189,000,000 tons, it is very easy to see that that would work out at about ¾d.

per ton. That is rather different to 2d. a ton. ["Hear, hear!"] Mr. Merivale, the celebrated mining engineer, puts the cost at two-thirds of a penny per ton.

MR. BAINBRIDGE said he was very glad the right hon. Gentleman and himself had chosen the same district, namely, Lancashire and Cheshire, as a test. He could certainly show that the cost in that district would be 2d. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I will leave my hon. Friend to fight that out with Mr. Merivale. Working it out in two totally different ways, I have arrived at the same figure.

MR. SETON-KARR: Has the right hon. Gentleman made his calculations on the maximum scale?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: No, not on the maximum, because everybody does not receive the maximum. I have made what I believe to be the fairest calculation, and I have taken the average wage at 23s. a week, whereas, I believe, it is now 26s. The hon. Member for Derby spoke of new liability; but I am sure he will admit that, whatever the amount of present liability, there are great moral claims which are freely recognised by many employers. Then there is the great advantage that it will get rid of litigation. That is, at all events, our intention. We shall try to make the Bill safe in that direction. I do not think that this Bill involves a serious burden on employers in this country. ["Hear, hear!"] Several details have been mentioned in the course of the Debate, but I do not think that there are any of them to which I need particularly refer. There is the danger of bankruptcy which I think ought to be considered. Then there was a reference to the payment of doctors; that will have our consideration. I think we have swept away a great deal as to contributory negligence. I have discussed this matter with employers, and there is great difficulty, and a great many people do feel that, after all, it is better to pay compensation than to run the chance of litigation. We believe that this Bill will minimise the hardship which attaches to the workmen in securing compensation, and we believe that it will tend to diminish litigation. If there are objections to the details of the Bill, we shall be willing to consider them. Our object has been to establish a principle which we hope will commend itself not only to this House, but to the country in general. I cannot admit that the Bill, as has been said, has been crudely drafted; on the contrary, I can assure the House that the Bill is based on a principle which we believe to be sound and thoroughly impartial in spirit. Under these circumstances I hope the House will be disposed to pass the Measure. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. THOMAS BURT (Morpeth) said he was seldom seized with an overpowering desire to make a speech, and did not care to enter into competition with the many hon. Gentlemen who wished to address the House that night, but he had been so long and so closely associated with the question of employers' liability that he felt he could hardly give a silent vote upon that occasion. The hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Broadhurst) had stated that 17 years ago he addressed the House on this question. He was a little surprised a day or two ago when looking over "Hansard's Debates," to find that in 1876—more than 20 years ago—he supported a Bill dealing with the question. On that occasion his Friend, the late Mr. Macdonald, the then Member for Stafford, brought in a Bill to abolish the doctrine of common employment. Sir John Holker, the then Attorney General, opposed the Measure, and pointed out the terrible liabilities it would throw upon the trade of the country. There were at that time very few lawyers in the House prepared to attack the doctrine of common employment, but now it was exceedingly difficult to find a distinguished lawyer, unless he was also a large employer of labour, who would defend that doctrine. The present Bill did not abolish that doctrine, but it certainly very considerably weakened it, and it would be exceedingly difficult to maintain the doctrine of common employment as applicable to the other trades outside this Bill when the Bill became an Act of Parliament. The main principle of the Measure was to provide for all accidents, though it really did not do that completely. It was, however, a great stride in that direction. Personally he had always been anxious that all accidents should be provided for. He had never opposed a general system of insurance on its merits, but he had always objected to a national scheme of insurance in substitution of employers' liability. Attention had already been called to the important exclusions from this Bill. There were the seamen, for example, who were certainly in the category of dangerous trades, and who, therefore, ought logically to be included within the scope of the Measure. There was, however, great force in the argument that seamen hitherto had always been legislated for separately, and that might be a valid reason for their exclusion; but he hoped that an assurance would be given that before long the benefits of this legislation would be extended to seamen. Then domestic servants were excluded from the scope of the Bill, and foremen, managers, and clerks. [Sir M. W. RIDLEY explained that foremen were not excluded.] The exclusion of domestic servants from the Bill of 1893 was, he remembered, severely criticised by the present Colonial Secretary. A good deal had been said about the cost that would be thrown upon employers by the Bill, especially in the mining industry. The hon. Member for Oldham had rather minimised the importance of the question of cost, and had ridiculed the sum of twopence per ton as an amount scarcely worth considering. He might tell the hon. Member that he had been engaged in miners' strikes that were protracted for 17 or 18 weeks, the matter in dispute when narrowed down, being only a penny per ton. In the part of the country with which he was specially connected, 80 per cent. of the total produce was exported. The extra cost there could not possibly be thrown upon the consumer, and, therefore, the question must be settled between employer and workman and might become a serious matter. He believed that in the long run the workmen would have to pay, but he did not mention this as an objection against the Bill. He would like to assure the hon. Member for Derby that, whatever other effect might accrue from this Bill, it would not touch the trade unions injuriously. ["Hear, hear!"] They were too firmly embedded in the confidence, and in the affections of the workmen of the country, for this or any other Bill, or for this or any other Government, even if they desired, which he did not believe they did, to injure them in the slightest possible degree. But there were other institutions of very great value of which he could not speak with equal confidence, although he did not take a gloomy view of the effects of this Bill upon them. He referred to the Miners' Permanent Relief Funds. ["Hear, hear!"] These institutions had about 300,000 members at the present time throughout the country. The parent society was the Northumberland and Durham Miners' Permanent Relief Fund, which in 1896 had a membership of 122,000. The members' contributions last year were £99,167, and the owners' percentages were £4,585. There were paid to widows and children £20,500; to men permanently disabled, £15,400; and the superannuation to aged miners was £34,000. By their trade unions they also made provision for their unemployed members. They were self-help institutions—["hear, hear!"]—and every one would admit that these societies reflected the greatest credit upon the workmen in the North of England and upon those colliery owners who had contributed to them. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Whitehaven said that if men could get provision quite independent of their societies they would not contribute to them. He feared there would be some tendency in that direction, and he was not at all confident that a Bill of this kind would not injuriously affect these societies. He was not without hope, however, that instead of destroying them the result of the Bill might be to induce employers of labour to approach their workmen with a view to contributing more largely to the support of these societies than they had done heretofore. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Derby said that this Bill would be a sort of high school for malingering. He did not like that word at all, or the idea it conveyed, though it might have some substance in fact. He believed that originally it was applied as a military term. He did not think it was characteristic of the soldier to malinger, and he was perfectly certain that it was an exceedingly exceptional thing in connection with the working population of this country. [*Cheers.*] His own experience was that for one man who would sham illness when he was not ill they would have a dozen who would go to work before they were fit. ["Hear, hear!"] Workmen, however, like other people, had a great deal of human nature in them, and if Parliament increased the benefits beyond a certain point, and gave a man more for lying idle than for working, he might be put under considerable temptation to remain idle. [*Laughter.*] His belief was that the best way to deal with this would be to get the workmen and the employers to co-operate. ["Hear, hear!"] The ordinary workman had a stronger dislike to any form of shamming than the ordinary employer, and he was sure that he had far less sympathy with it than the ordinary candidate for Parliament. [*Laughter.*] Therefore, he thought that if they could get the employers and workmen to combine they would effectively put a stop to anything in the direction of an imposition of this kind. To his mind the weak points in the Bill were in the direction of protection and safety, and he attached great importance to that question. The Colonial Secretary and the Home Secretary rather indicated that something might be done in the way of strengthening the criminal law. He was not one of those who believed that the best way to deal with careless men was to impose pecuniary obligations and still less criminal penalties upon them. He had much more confidence in a thorough and complete record of accidents of all kinds, and in having them thoroughly investigated. Though he disliked litigation, one of its advantages was to let in light and to enable the facts to be got at more thoroughly. While he did not think that the Bill would increase the number of accidents, he was afraid it would not diminish them. That, he thought, was the weak point in the Bill. If the Amendment of his hon. Friend was a mere abstract proposition he would say "aye" to it, but hon. Members were practical men who had to deal with a practical subject; and if he succeeded in being in a majority in supporting his hon. Friend the result would be that the Bill would be defeated. He did not want to defeat the Bill. [*Cheers.*] He wanted to amend it. It was not a satisfactory Bill; it was not a complete Measure. No Bill would be satisfactory or complete that did not abolish the doctrine of common employment, and entirely prohibit contracting out of its provisions. This Bill did neither the one nor the other, but it was a very long step in a new and good direction. It was experimental; and, as far as he was concerned, he wanted to give the experiment a fair chance of succeeding. Any influence he possessed would be directed rather to amending the Bill than to defeating it. [*Cheers.*]

MR. C. A. CRIPPS (Gloucester, Stroud) said he agreed with the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) that in its general principle this Bill did not introduce a dangerous experiment but really a most beneficial reform. He was decidedly of opinion that the scope of the Bill went far enough and should not be enlarged in any of the directions suggested. Sufficient attention had not been paid to the limitation of the employers' liability which the Bill introduced. In the first place it was not a question between the existing law and what was proposed in the Bill. They were agreed on both sides that the doctrine of common employment could be no longer maintained as far as the employments included in the Bill were concerned. Therefore it was not a question of a new liability contrasted with the liability already existing; it was rather that of a limited liability to insurance as against unlimited liability to the negligence which would arise if they did away with the doctrine of common employment. Hon. Members who wished to abolish that doctrine were hardly consistent in opposing a Bill which proposed to do away with it as regarded all the more dangerous employments, such as mining, railways, and factories. [VOICES: "We don't object!"] There was a point which seemed to have escaped the notice of those who objected to the Bill. At present employers were liable both for their own negligence and for that of their servants in cases where the doctrine of common employment did not apply. But within the scope of the Bill this liability was removed, and outside the Bill no employer could be liable as regarded the specified industries unless the arbitrator or a County Court Judge sitting as arbitrator found him guilty of wilful and wrongful default. That was a most important safeguard, and a safeguard to which he thought the employers were fully entitled. He did not want to look at the Bill from the point of view of the workman any more than from that of the employer. The Bill ought as far as possible to be a fair adjustment as between the two interests. He agreed with the hon. Member for Morpeth that probably the most perfect adjustment would be made by agreement as between the parties, by their mutual contribution to a common fund. But if they could not rely on the voluntary principle, and they had to introduce legislative enactments, then it was essential that the interest of the employer should have as full recognition and be as carefully protected as the interest of the workman. He had said already that he hoped the scope of the Bill would not be extended. Let him mention one or two points in which its scope might be further limited. He did not wish to reintroduce the principle of contributory negligence. Anyone who appreciated that the Bill was founded on the doctrine of insurance would know that the principle of contributory negligence could hardly come in at all. In his opinion no workman ought to be entitled to any compensation whatever where the accident or injury was directly attributable to his wilful or wrongful act. Suppose a workman had committed an act for which he would be criminally responsible, say, lighting a pipe in a mine. Was he, in respect of a criminal act of that kind, which might do injury to a large number of his fellow workmen, to be entitled to claim compensation either against his employer or any other fund? For his part he could see nothing but injustice in the application of such a doctrine. When the Secretary of State for the Colonies brought forward his Amendment in 1893 he excluded from the operation of his compensation scheme "injuries due to the negligence of the workman." He did not wish to carry his principle quite so far as that, but was it just they should provide compensation—he did not care from what source—when the injury complained of was the direct result of the wrongful and wilful act of the complainant? He agreed as to getting rid of contributory negligence if they wanted to get rid of litigation, but merely to say the man was not to get compensation where the injury was brought about by his own wilful act was not introducing any difficulty, such as they found in contributory negligence; it was merely asking the arbitrator to decide, in the case of the workman, the very same point which under this Bill he was asked to decide in the case of the employer. This Act might be a stepping-stone towards further legislation, and if this House once assented to the proposition that a man was entitled to compensation for injury brought about by his own wilful act, and if they were to apply that principle to all employments in the country, he maintained they would have introduced a principle not founded on justice, but on injustice, which would throw an improper liability on the employer, or upon the fellow workman, or upon the consumer. There were two other points to which he desired to call attention with regard to the scope of the Bill. It was very necessary, to his mind, in order that the employer might be protected, that the extent of the liability should be clearly ascertained. In one respect this Bill in no sense clearly ascertained the liability of the employer. Supposing a man was incapacitated at a very young age, was that to say that the employer was liable to provide for all time an annuity in respect of the injury so suffered? He did not believe any principle of that kind could possibly fairly and properly work as between the two parties. It was not the principle they found in any of their friendly societies at the present day. It was not that he feared malingering or anything of that sort, but whether they were dealing with an individual employer or a company, it would be an essential to the fair working of this Bill that the limit of liability should be fairly ascertained, and they could not ascertain that liability in order to insure against it, and in order to make fair provision for it without they limited in some way the amount of compensation which might be claimed not only in the case of a man's death, but also in case of permanent incapacity owing to some injury suffered in the course of employment. Might he point out to the House that this difficulty was to a certain extent, though imperfectly, dealt with in the Bill itself in this way. The question of the amount to be paid to a man for permanent incapacity might be reopened every three months before the arbitrator, or County Court Judge who acted as arbitrator under this Bill. That would be a most fertile source of the very litigation it was one of the objects of the Bill to get rid of. It would be far better to keep out altogether this power of reopening the question and to settle once for all in the case of incapacity as well as death what the payment was to be within some maximum amount fixed in the Bill itself. He was strongly in favour of the principle of contracting out, and he hoped no concession would be made by the Government in the way of defeating the contracting out clause contained in the Bill. But there was one point to which he would ask the attention of the Secretary for the Colonies. When the matter came before the Registrar of Friendly Societies to decide whether the provisions of the Bill were more favourable, or the provisions under some arrangement made between employers and employed, the Registrar was to look to the conditions as a whole. Did that mean he was to consider all the advantages which the workman got and not merely the amount that would be paid to him either in the case of death or incapacity? These funds contained provisions for sickness, old age, and a variety of provisions, all of which operated more or less directly in favour of the workmen, and he wanted to know whether the Registrar of Friendly Societies had to take all these conditions into consideration when he was considering whether the conditions of the Bill were more favourable or the provisions under a scheme of this kind. If all the conditions were to be taken into consideration, and the whole position of the workman was to be ascertained, then he thought that a large number of these schemes must succeed in future as they had succeeded in the past. But if, on the other hand, they were only to be considered in a limited sense, and the only question was to be whether the amount of compensation in the case of death or incapacity was larger in the one instance than in the other, then he foresaw for his own part not only that no new schemes of this kind would be initiated, but that existing schemes could not endure for any appreciable time. It was most important that the position of the employer under the Bill should be really ascertained, so that in bringing in this novel and beneficial principle, it should be framed on a just, sound, and equitable basis, and it was from that point of view that he had drawn the attention of the House to the three points which he hoped the Government would carefully consider in their future conduct as regarded this Bill dealing with a great question, which might put an end to much friction as between workmen on the one side and employers on the other.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."—Debate arising;

Debate adjourned till To-morrow.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [13th May], "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc."

Question again proposed.—Debate resumed.

Mr. J. SAMUEL (Stockton) expressed the hope that the Motion would not be persisted in, as it would not be possible for all hon. Members who took an interest in the subject to be placed on that Committee—

The hon. Member was speaking at midnight, when the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be Read the Third time to-morrow.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tomorrow.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tomorrow.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

POST OFFICE (SITES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Third Reading deferred till To-morrow.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read the Third time, and passed.

DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

PATENT OFFICE EXTENSION (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Committee deferred till Monday next.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Thursday.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Tomorrow.

FINANCE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LAW OF EVIDENCE (CRIMINAL CASES) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES' OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

HIGHWAYS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 2nd June.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (SCOTLAND) LOANS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

TITHE REDEMPTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (LONDON) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY FOR INJURIES TO WORKMEN BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

PRISONERS' PERSONAL CORRECTION PROHIBITION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 3rd June.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned till Thursday.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SHOP ASSISTANTS (HALF-HOLIDAY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

House Adjourned at Five Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 18th May 1897.

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

Lord NORTON gave notice that on Friday next he would ask the Lord President of the Council whether he hoped to be able to introduce a Bill on the subject of Secondary Education this Session, or early next year.

QUARTER SESSIONS JURORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment: The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and the Bill to be printed as amended.—(No. 90.)

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL. [H.L.]

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments: The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.—(No. 91.)

NAVY AND MARINES (WILLS) ACT (1866) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be Read 3ª on Thursday next.

METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS (HOLIDAYS) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

RAILWAY ASSESSORS (SCOTLAND) SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order) and passed.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY (TRANSFER OF PATRONAGE) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be Read 2ª on Friday next—(*The Earl of Denbigh*).—(No. 92.)

House adjourned at Twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, to Thursday next, a Quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

HIGHGATE WOODS PRESERVATION BILL.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders be suspended and that leave be given to bring in "A Bill to authorise the acquisition of lands known as Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, for the purposes of a public open space," and that Mr. Stephens, Mr. Bigwood, and Mr. Lough do prepare and bring it in.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that the Bill be now Read the First Time and ordered to be Read a Second time.—(*Dr. Farquharson.*)

Bill Read the First time, and ordered to be Read a Second time.

QUESTIONS.

PRISON CLERKS.

Mr. H. C. F. LUTTRELL (Devon, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that there are still 32 prison clerks eligible by age for the post of fifth class governor who are senior to those clerks who joined under special examination on payment of £3 fee, and as the posts are being given to their seniors, and as the average age of these clerks who joined at special examination is now about 40 years, there is little or no prospect of their receiving direct benefit in the customary course of promotion by the special selection of clerks under 45 years of age for the post of fifth class governor; whether the small benefit which might accrue indirectly by promotion of those senior to them will be detracted from by the non-continuance of allowances as acting storekeepers; and, whether he can see his way to reconsider their claims?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I am aware that there are 32 clerks senior to those who paid the £3 fee, but the hon. Member is mistaken if, as I gather, he supposes that this latter class passed any special examination or have any special claims to promotion. They will, however, receive very considerable benefit from the creation of the new class of governor, as the appointments to that class will be made by selection, not by seniority; and the advantage generally which the scheme will confer by opening up a new path of advancement and increasing the chances of promotion more than compensates for the abolition of the allowance to an acting storekeeper. I am afraid I cannot promise to reconsider the question.

LOCK HOSPITALS.

MR. ARTHUR JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he has received a copy of the unanimous Resolution lately passed by the Committee of the Aldershot Lock Hospital to the effect that the attention of the Government should be called to the advisability of insisting on the patients in Home Lock Hospitals being detained until free from infection as in other dangerous, infectious, or contagious diseases; and, whether he can take steps to carry out this Resolution?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): There is not now at Aldershot a lock hospital under military control; but the Government subscribes to a certain number of beds in the Hartley-Wintney and Farnham Union. A Resolution from the Committee of the hospital of the union has been received by the Secretary of State. While sympathising with the object of the Resolution the Secretary of State for War has no power make regulations for the treatment of patients in the hospital.

MR. JEFFREYS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that there was a voluntary lock hospital at Aldershot in which there were a certain number of soldier patients?

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir; but that hospital is the Union hospital. With regard to the hospital, the Secretary of State has no power to use it in any other way than as a voluntary hospital.

CONGO STATE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, after recent revelations as to the administration of the Congo State, Her Majesty's Government will consider the possibility of revoking the temporary lease, by Lord Kimberley, to the Sovereign of the Congo State, of territory on the Nile, the consideration for the granting of the lease, in the shape of a lease of other territory by the Congo State to Great Britain, having been withdrawn by the action of the Congo State?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): Abuses will, it is hoped, be prevented by the Commission for the protection of the natives in the Congo State, which was appointed in September last. Her Majesty's Government do not regard the present as an opportune occasion for consideration of the circumstances produced by the cancellation of part of the Agreement of 1894.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

MR. D. F. GODDARD (Ipswich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to two sentences, each of 14 days' imprisonment, recently passed on lads of 15 years of age in Suffolk—one by the Woodbridge Bench of magistrates on a boy who had taken a watch from a drunken man, given part of it away, and exchanged the rest for a pocket knife; and the other by the Mildenhall Bench of Magistrates for trespassing in pursuit of game; and, whether he will consider if he can amend the law, either by legislation or otherwise, so as to prevent the passing of such sentences on mere youths, who are in this way brought into the society of habitual criminals?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: The hon. Member has been good enough to send me a newspaper report of these two cases, but there is nothing in the report which would lead me to suppose that the boys have been treated with undue severity. The question how to diminish the evils attendant upon imprisonment of youths, including that to which the hon. Member refers, is one which is constanly under my consideration.

DIVISIONS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

MR. J. W. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury whether, for the convenience of Members during Divisions, especially when occurring at midnight, the door on the right side of the Outer Lobby, leading directly down to the Members' Cloak Room, could be unlocked before the declaration of the numbers of the Divisions, as is done at present in the case of the door opposite leading to the Library; and whether he would consult the authorities of the House with a view to carrying this out?

SIR WILLIAM WALROND (Devon, Tiverton): I am afraid it would be difficult to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member, but I will discuss the matter with the proper authorities.

FLAX (FOREIGN BOUNTIES).

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there is any bounty upon the deport of flax in Russia, and Belgium, and, if so, what is its amount per ton; and whether there is any bounty on the export of wheat from Argentina; and, if so, what is its amount?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have no knowledge of any such bounties.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would make further inquiries into the matter?

MR. RITCHIE: If the hon. Gentleman will furnish me with the information he possesses, I will consider it, and see whether there is any ground for further inquiry.

ARMY SURGEONS (ROYAL CORPS).

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that in 1879 the War Office agreed to the issue of a warrant sanctioning the formation of a Royal Corps of Army Surgeons, whether he can state the reasons why legislative effect was not given to this recommendation; and whether the present War Office is prepared to follow the example of its predecessor?

MR. BRODRICK: A proposal to constitute the medical officers a corps of Royal Army Surgeons was made and considered in 1879, but was not adopted. I have explained already the reasons which make the Secretary of State unwilling to reopen the question.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of cases in which a rural sanitary authority has made application to adopt Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890; and, in how many instances Part III. has been adopted and carried into effect in rural districts?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Applications for the certificate of the County Council authorising the adoption of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act 1890, are not reported to the Local Government Board, and I am therefore unable to state the number of such cases. There has only been one case in which a loan has been sanctioned by the Board on the application of a Rural District Council for the purchase of land and the erection of working class dwellings under the authority of Part III. of the Act.

GRAND JURY SYSTEM (IRELAND).

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Irish Government have yet considered any scheme for the reform of the Grand Jury system in Ireland?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): It is not the intention of the Government during the present Session to deal by legislation with the subject of the Grand Jury system in Ireland.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say that it was the intention of the Government to deal with the matter in another Session?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No; I think that that would be going too far ahead.

CANALS (IRELAND).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission or Select Committee to inquire into the ownership and management of the canals in Ireland, in view of the general complaint against the system of having canals owned by railway companies whose efforts are directed to divert the traffic to their lines?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There is only one canal in Ireland owned by a railway company, namely, the Royal Canal, which was transferred to the Midland Great Western Railway Company under statutory powers. Under the Railway and Canal Acts, the company cannot hinder the access of any bye-trader to the canal, provided such trader pays the tolls, not exceeding the maximum allowed by the Board of Trade. I should not be prepared to consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission or Select Committee without further evidence of the necessity for inquiry than is at present before me.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked whether, if he supplied the right hon. Gentleman with evidence for the traders in the locality, he would consider the matter.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot make any promise beforehand, but I will certainly consider the matter.

MERCANTILE MARINE (FOREIGN OFFICERS AND ENGINEERS).

MR. FORTESCUE FLANNERY (York, W.R., Shipley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether certificates of competency as masters' mates and engineers are issued to foreigners without naturalisation; and whether any provision, either in the law or practice of the shipping offices exists to prevent a British ship being commanded, officered, and manned entirely by foreigners; and, if not, whether the Government will accept an Amendment of the Undermanning Bill so as to render impossible this source of danger in time of war?

MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir. Certificates of competency as masters' mates and engineers are issued to foreigners with the prescribed qualifications, without naturalisation and there is no provision, either in the law, or in the practice of the shipping offices, to prevent a British ship being officered and manned entirely by foreigners. I am not prepared to propose or accept an Amendment of the Undermanning Bill to alter the law in this respect.

SIR ARTHUR FORWOOD (Lancashire, Ormskirk): May I ask whether, in any commercial undertaking in the country, there is any law restricting the nationality of the persons employed?

MR. RITCHIE: I believe my right hon. Friend is correct in saying that no restriction is placed upon any industry in this country in this respect.

MR. FLANNERY: Arising out of the answer of the right hon. Gentleman, may I ask if it be true that foreigners are debarred from owning British ships or any portion of a British ship by law, and if the right hon. Gentleman—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a new Question altogether.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, in order to join in the general illumination of the heights round the Metropolis, and of the country at large, he is willing to cause the summit of the Victoria Tower of the Houses of Parliament to be illuminated, by electric lights following the tracery, by coloured fires, or otherwise, at 10 p.m. upon Queen's Night, 22nd June 1897?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I do not see my way to carry out the suggestion of my hon. Friend. The matter presents considerable difficulties, but I will endeavour to some extent to meet his views, if I find that the difficulties to which I have alluded are not insuperable.

MR. R. ASCROFT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that an accident happened at the last Jubilee through a string of flags and other decorations falling across the road whilst the Royal Procession was passing; and whether, with a view to prevent the possibility of any similar accident on Jubilee Day, he will take such steps as may be necessary to bring to the notice of the occupiers of premises along the line of route the absolute necessity of seeing that all flags and decorations suspended across the roadway are hung in a safe and efficient manner?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I cannot recall the accident to which the hon. Member alludes, and I am not aware that I have any powers in the matter. I will look into the matter, however, and consult with the Commissioner with the view of seeing whether any action is possible or desirable.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he intends to make arrangements for the accommodation aboard ship of Members of Parliament to enable them to view the naval manœuvres on 26th June next?

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): It is the intention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to make arrangements for the accommodation aboard ship of Members of Parliament to enable them to view the naval review on June 26 next.

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is prepared to make a statement in reference to the Irish treason-felony prisoners; and whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to grant them amnesty in commemoration of the Diamond Jubilee?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to answer the Question. I have nothing to add to the declarations I have made in this House on this subject or to what has been stated by the Leader of the House upon it.

MR. FLAVIN: May I ask the right hon Gentleman whether the Government are prepared to take the responsibility on their shoulders of keeping these men in gaol until their legal term expires? [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

LONGFORD CANAL HARBOUR.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland (1) whether, as Chief Law Officer of the Crown in Ireland, intrusted with the carrying out of such measures as tend to preserve human life from destruction, he is satisfied that the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland have fulfilled the obligations imposed on them by statute for the protection of human life in Longford, having regard to the frequent loss of life in the canal harbour there for want of proper railing and fencing; (2) whether he is aware that, at their ordinary monthly meeting on Tuesday week, the Longford Town Commissioners strongly condemned the action of the Midland Great Western Railway Company in leaving this harbour, in which little or no traffic is carried on, and situate in the middle of the Market Square, unfenced; and (3) whether he will call the attention of the Lord Lieutenant or Board of Control, or the Railway Commissioners, to this dangerous part of the Royal Canal, or, in the alternative, will he advise the Irish Government to grant a Commission to inquire into the manner in which the Midland Great Western Railway Company acquired this canal and have managed it since acquiring it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The first paragraph of the hon. Member's question is founded on a misconception of the duties of the Attorney General. The canal and harbour are, I believe, in the same unfenced condition they were in when acquired by the company in 1845, and the company contend that under the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 119, they are entitled to use these works as they are, and are not bound to fence them, but they inform me they have laid a case before counsel as to their liability in that respect, and further report that they have always furnished quarterly reports to the Board of Trade and Board of Control of the various works which have been carried out to maintain the navigation in proper order. The attention of the Board of Trade and Board of Control will be called to the matter. I must decline to advise the Government to issue any Commission, and beg to remind the hon. Member that if the railway company are under any obligation to fence this harbour, an action will lie against them at the suit of any person who sustains injury through the neglect of that duty.

TELEGRAMS (OLDHAM).

MR. ASCROFT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that all telegrams dispatched from London to Oldham (and *vice versâ*), which has in the Parliamentary borough over 200,000 inhabitants, have to be sent first to Manchester, and thence transferred by wire to Oldham, thereby causing great delay and inconvenience; whether he is aware that the speech delivered by the First Lord of the Treasury on the Sunday Closing Bill in Ireland on the 12th instant was sent from the House of Commons telegraph office at 4.15 p.m., and only arrived at Oldham at 5.30 p.m., and whether there is any means by which the speed can be increased above two and a-half miles a minute; whether he is aware that great inconvenience and loss is occasioned through there being no direct telegraph wire between London and Oldham; whether he is aware that no telegrams can be dispatched or received at the head office in Oldham between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., and that a distance of seven miles has to be travelled before one can be sent from the nearest office; and whether he is prepared to receive a deputation from the Corporation of Oldham, the Chamber of Commerce, and other public bodies in the town, in respect thereof, or to consider the possibility of removing the cause of grievance complained of, with a view to granting to Oldham such telegraph facilities as its importance as a large commercial centre justifies?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The Postmaster General is aware that telegrams between London and Oldham have to be re-transmitted at Manchester; also that the head telegraph office at Oldham is closed between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., and that the nearest office open all night is about seven miles distant. As to the rest of the Question, he cannot, on this short notice, give any answer, but he will be glad to have an inquiry made, and he will then be in a position to consider whether it is necessary to trouble the Corporation and other public bodies to send a deputation.

CHARGE OF MURDER (CO. TYRONE).

MR. G. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that two brothers named Maguire were tried at the Omagh Summer Assizes of 1896 for the murder of William Funston, at Trillick, county Tyrone, 9th March 1896, on which occasion the jury were unable to agree; that they were tried again for the crime at the Belfast Winter Assizes of the same year and were found not guilty; (2) is he also aware that after their acquittal they were sent back to prison and kept there till the Spring Assizes at Omagh, 1897, when they were placed on trial for the larceny of money from the dead body of William Funston, though Judge Andrews, who presided at the first trial, told the jury in substance that there was no satisfactory proof of the robbery, as none of the money had been traced to the prisoners, with the result that the jury had to be discharged, as they could not agree; and (3) in view of the fact that the Maguires have already undergone three trials, two disagreements, and one acquittal, that they have suffered over 14 months' imprisonment, and that until the sad occurrence of Funston's death they bore the character of peaceable and respectable young men, will he recommend their release?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: With my right hon. Friend's permission I will reply to this Question. The facts stated in the first paragraph are correct. The representations contained in the second paragraph of the nature of Judge Andrews' charge are incorrect, the rest of the statements in this paragraph are substantially accurate. The Government cannot accede to the course suggested in the third paragraph; and, as the trial of these men is still pending, I must decline to make or concur in any statement as to their character.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION INSURANCE) BILL (BELGIUM).

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will use his influence with the Foreign Office to move Her Majesty's Legation at Brussels to briefly report at once on the proposed Belgian Workmen's Compensation Insurance Bill?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I have already written to the Foreign Office to ask that this report may be obtained.

ARMY REMOUNTS.

Mr. J. F. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the contention of local experts that the Australian horses are superior to those imported from Argentina, and the strongly expressed opinion to the same effect of British officers in India, he will consider the advisability of despatching to Australia a certain number of remount officers to investigate and report in this connection?

Mr. BRODRICK: The horses at present wanted are for South Africa, and as it is believed that suitable Argentine horses can be delivered there at half the price of Australian horses it is not considered necessary to send to Australia.

COVENT GARDEN THEATRE FUND.

Mr. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Parliamentary Charity Commissioner whether any further light has been thrown upon the Covent Garden Theatre Fund since the subject was mentioned last Session; and whether any steps are in contemplation, by amending Act or otherwise, to release this valuable fund and apply it to the charitable objects which its original founders had in view?

The PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. J. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk and Malton): As the hon. Member has been already informed, this Fund is not within the jurisdiction of the Charity Commissioners, who are not aware whether any such further information has been obtained or such steps taken as are mentioned in the question.

MANITOBA (CROFTERS' SETTLEMENTS).

Mr. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether an application for financial assistance has been addressed to Her Majesty's Government by the Crofters' settlements in Manitoba; and whether any decision in the matter has yet been arrived at?

Mr. H. T. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews Burghs): It is not accurate to say that an application for financial assistance has been addressed to Her Majesty's Government by the Crofters' settlements in Manitoba, but a communication from some of those interested has been received by the Colonisation Board on the subject, and no decision has as yet been arrived at.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what steps he intends taking with regard to the Vehicles (Lights) Bill, which applies to Ireland, and if passed into law would compel that every cart, car, or other vehicle must have a lighted lamp attached, if travelling after night?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: If the Bill reaches the Committee stage the Irish Government will be prepared to consider whether or not Ireland should be exempted from its provisions.

INDIAN AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the contract has been signed between the Government and the directors of the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company for the carriage of mails to and from India and Australia; and, if so, for what period; and whether the Government are seeing to it that the said Peninsular and Oriental Company complies with the law as set forth in Section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894?

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster General has not yet signed the new contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the carriage of mails to and from India and Australia. The contract will be for seven years. The last part of the hon. Member's Question should be addressed to the President of the Board of Trade.

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in accordance with the recommendations of the Tweedmouth Committee as regards good conduct stripes, it is the intention of the Postmaster General to at once issue the full number of stripes to those postmen who have qualified for them by length of service and good conduct?

Mr. HANBURY: Yes, Sir.

MERCANTILE MARINE (ACCIDENTS TO SEAMEN).

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state how many seamen were drowned during 1896, on British vessels, by reason of wrecks or casualties; how many seamen were injured during the same period from similar causes; how many seamen were killed on British vessels by accidents during the same period; and how many seamen were injured from the same cause; and whether he can state the total number of persons employed on British registered vessels during 1896?

Mr. RITCHIE: Figures showing the deaths of and injuries to seamen employed in British ships registered in the United Kingdom are now published monthly in *The Labour Gazette.* These figures show that, excluding Lascars, the number of seamen reported in 1896 to have been lost by shipping casualties to trading vessels registered under Part 1 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, was 941, and the number injured was 96. The number killed in such vessels by accidents other than wreck was 728; and the number injured was 2,027. The number of persons employed in December 1896 in trading vessels registered under Part 1 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, was 188,445, excluding Lascars. The number of Lascars employed in 1896 was 29,999.

BRITISH SEAMEN IN FOREIGN PORTS.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state what are the powers (if any) of Her Majesty's Consuls to impose imprisonment without trial upon British seamen in foreign ports; and if he is aware that several Consuls have so imprisoned British seamen?

Mr. RITCHIE: Her Majesty's Consuls have no power to impose imprisonment without trial upon British seamen in foreign ports.

GIPSIES.

Mr. T. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the necessity of giving powers to County Councils, or other authorities to deal with the question of gipsies and dwellers in tents and vans; and, whether he can now promise to introduce a Bill on the subject at an early date?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Provision is already made in Section 9 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act 1895, enabling local authorities to deal by means of bye-laws with nuisances caused by dwellers in tents and vans. This power, however, has been used in a very small number of cases only; and in these circumstances it can hardly be said, I think, that there is a case for further legislation.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Do these powers apply to Primrose League vans?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: They apply only to persons who cause a nuisance. [*Laughter and cheers.*]

LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that an election for clerk of Petty Sessions for the Letterbreen district, County Fermanagh, was held on the 19th February last; that on memorials forwarded to the Irish authorities they annulled the election and ordered another to be held on the 21st instant; and, will he say on what grounds the successful candidate was disqualified and the said election voided, and why the candidate who obtained the next largest vote was not appointed without further action?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The election to the Petty Sessions Clerkship of Letterbreen, held on the 19th February, was not annulled in consequence of memorials received by Government, but because the election was bad having regard to the terms of the advertisement inviting candidates to apply. A fresh election will take place on Friday next.

SUPPLY (COLONIAL OFFICE VOTE).

Sir W. HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): May I ask what arrangements the First Lord of the Treasury proposes with regard to Friday's business?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester E.): As the House is aware, I arranged, in deference to a wish expressed on behalf of the Opposition, to take the South African Vote next Friday. Since then it appears that it would probably be inexpedient, in view of pending negotiations, that there should be a discussion upon South African affairs at so early a date, and I understand that the right hon. Gentleman has been made acquainted with that fact and has no objection to a change being introduced into the order of our proceedings on Friday. Therefore, under these circumstances, I propose to accede to a request made to me by the Irish Members and to take the Irish Votes instead on Friday. ["Hear, hear!"]

SIR W. HARCOURT: I can only say that when it was intimated to me that discussion in this House might prejudicially interfere with negotiations going on for the settlement of affairs in South Africa, I had no hesitation in releasing the right hon. Gentleman from his pledge. ["Hear, hear!"]

SITTING OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order, Sittings of the House.—(*First Lord of the Treasury*).

MOTIONS.

GROUND GAME ACT (EXTENSION TO COPYHOLDERS).

Bill to extend to Copyholders in certain cases the provisions of the Ground Game Act 1880, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing and Mr. Bramston Beach; presented and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Wednesday 26th May, and to be printed.—[Bill 258.]

DISTRICT COUNCILS (WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES).

Bill for giving Facilities for a pure Water Supply in Rural Districts, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Cotton-Jodrell, Sir John Brunner, and Mr. Tollemache; presented, and Read First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 259.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (NO. 2.)

Bill to amend section eleven of the Local Government Act 1888, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Broadhurst, Sir John Dorington, and Mr. McKenna; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 260.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [17th May], "That the Bill be now Read a Second time:"—and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add instead the words;—

> "No Bill dealing with Accidents to Workmen will be satisfactory to this House which does not provide for the prevention of Accidents as well as for Compensation in case of Injury."—(*Mr. Drage*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate resumed.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire), said he intended to vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, and he would like to express his gratitude to the Government for having dealt with this difficult subject in a generous spirit. Two matters of interest had occupied the attention of the House. The first was how far a scheme of universal compensation was likely to act as a preventive of the occurrence and recurrence of accidents. They had been told by the Home Secretary and the Secretary for the Colonies that if they desired to prevent the occurrence of accidents they should seek for that in a strengthening of the criminal law. No one was more in favour of strengthening the criminal law than he was, but there were certain deficiencies in its administration which hindered it from being effective as a preventive of accidents. He contended that the penalties inflicted were most inadequate. There was the case of a boy killed in a factory, and the fine inflicted was £1. There was another case where a man was killed, and there again the fine was £1. It was evident that the criminal law wanted strengthening by such additional help as this Bill would supply. He would ask what was likely to be the effect on the minds of other employers when they saw how easy it was to escape the law? Allusion had been made by his hon. Friend the Member for Derby, and figures had been given showing that accidents had not increased in Germany. According to figures he found that the numbers in 1887 were 15,900, and in 1895, 75,000, and the amount expended in compensation in 1886 was two million marks, and in 1895 50 million marks. In other words, the number of accidents compensated had largely multiplied. The figures were not absolutely convincing, because it did not follow that there were more accidents because of the increase in those reported and their consequent compensation. A further question raised by the hon. Member for Derby was what was likely to be the economic bearing of such a scheme as the present. On whom would the burden fall? Those who, like his hon. Friend and himself, were engaged in industrial production, knew how difficult it was to raise prices, and how reluctant they were to accept diminished dividends. As to the reasons given by the Home Secretary for excluding certain trades, he did not think he had made out his case. Take agriculture. The right hon. Gentleman said it was not included because there were so few statistics in their possession. The returns showed that there were as many accidents in agriculture through machinery as in the whole textile trade. He regretted the exclusion of workshops. There were 79,000 registered factories, and almost one-half of them employed less than ten persons. If the burden was one fitted to be borne by the occupiers of these small factories, it was also fitted for the occupiers of large workshops. The right hon. Gentleman said there were fewer accidents in workshops than in factories, but he did not understand him to say that these figures were conclusive. The Government, by excluding workshops, would exclude a particularly dangerous trade. He alluded to that of generating electricity. The transforming chambers would be regarded as workshops. The dangers in those departments of electric shock were great. Since 1892, 14 fatal accidents had occurred through electrical current, and out of those seven happened in transforming chambers. That afforded a good reason for the Government to bring workshops within the purview of the Bill. Why, he asked, should a person engaged in the bottling of aerated waters be denied the benefits of the Bill? It was not necessary that such bottling should be done in factories, indeed it was constantly done in workshops. In excluding workshops from the operation of the Bill the Government were taking a very serious, if not a retrograde, step, the result of which it was difficult to forecast. But there was an even greater anomaly than the exclusion of workshops; he alluded to the interpretation of the words "personal injury by accident." What was an accident? There was hardly any clause in the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife to which greater importance was attached, or which gave greater satisfaction to the working classes, than the clause which fixed the responsibility on the employer for accidents to workpeople engaged in dangerous trades. The Government claimed to be dealing with dangerous trades; but was it not idle to make such a claim when they withheld from the operation of the Measure such trades as the white-lead trade, the india-rubber trade, the pottery trade, and equally dangerous trades? ["Hear, hear!"] He maintained that a man who had his health impaired suffered more than the man who met with an accident; because, while they were both debarred from winning their daily bread, the man injured in health handed down to his children a sickly frame and a diseased organisation which unfitted them for useful citizenship. In conclusion, he desired to say that he and his hon. Friends in criticising the Measure were only anxious to strengthen the Measure and to widen its scope. The Government had now a great opportunity, and it was but fair to say they recognised the fact. But if they did not deal generously with the suggestions which had been made from different quarters of the House in respect to the widening of the scope of the Bill, and the doing away with the inequalities of the Measure, he feared they would throw away their matchless opportunity. If, on the other hand, they did deal generously with those suggestions, they would not only earn the gratitude of the House but would "give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death."

*MR. LIONEL HOLLAND (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley) said that to-night they had to consider the main principle and not the details of the Bill. They had to decide whether or not the time had now arrived to cease tinkering with the question of employers' liability, and to put the question upon a permanent, broad, and logical footing. He had listened carefully to the speeches delivered during the Debate, and as far as he could gather three main objections had been urged against the principle of the Bill. It had been said that a system of general compensation covered by insurance would tend to make the employers careless as to the precautions they took for the safety of their men; it had been said that the compensation would be deducted from the wages of the men; and the fear had been expressed that the charge for insurance would be so large as to act as a handicap to the development of trade and enterprise in Great Britain. If the last objection could be substantiated it would, in his opinion, more than counterbalance all the advantages which could be gained from the Bill. But it seemed rather curious that we should be unable to do in England generally what many of the employers in England had done voluntarily, and what was made compulsory upon all employers in most trades in Germany. The system of insurance in Germany was not less satisfactory to the employer than to the employed, although the burden which the system imposed on the employers was no light one. That was not altogether due to the generous nature of the compensation, but in great measure to the immense cost of the management expenses. The latter expenses amounted to one-third of the compensation which was given; and the cost of insurance, which fell directly on the employer, came to from £1 to £1 4s., and £1 12s. in some trades, per £100 paid in wages. It had been said that under this Bill insurance would amount to about 1 per cent., but he had been informed that insurance companies would be able to effect the insurance at about 15s. for every £100 paid in wages. If an employer wished to insure his risk under the present Act he was charged from 2s. 6d. to 5s. for every £100 of wages, but if the doctrine of common employment were abolished, and it was agreed on all sides it should be abolished, the charge for insurance would be raised to about 10s. per £100. Therefore the increase in charge to the employer under this Bill, and a Bill which merely abolished common employment, would be about 5s. per £100 paid in wages. He maintained that the increased charge upon the employer would not be altogether a real charge, because to a great extent he would receive compensation by some indirect benefits which would accrue from the Bill. Litigation would not be altogether abolished, but the opportunities for litigation would be materially decreased. The liability of the employer would be an ascertained and defined liability, and not an arbitrary and unknown liability. Besides this, he would be relieved from many of the charitable obligations, or what almost seemed to be moral obligations, to relieve the relatives of an injured working man or the injured man himself. It was far better that a man should stand on an independent footing and know that what he claimed was under an Act of Parliament, than that he should have to depend on the charity of his employer. This Measure had not, and could not, escape its allowance of gloomy predictions. The prophets of evil had never been absent when any Measure affecting the management of industrial operations had been before the House. An hon. Member opposite, representing the mining industry, had actually declared that the mines of England would be shut up and that thousands of men would be walking over the country without any employment as the result of this Bill. It was curious that, in the Debates on the first Truck Act in 1831, there were Members on the opposite side of the House, foremost among them Mr. Joseph Hume, who stated that if the Bill were passed it would spell the ruin of many of the manufactures of the country, that manufacturers would shut up their works, and that men would be walking about unemployed until the Act was repealed, as they were certain it would be repealed. Since then trade and industry had prospered, and continued to prosper in spite of the fact that Measures of a similar nature, even more stringent in their character, had been passed down to last Session. He only instanced this as an illustration of the fact that the results which were predicted of an alteration of the law were not always the results which ultimately obtained. ["Hear, hear!"] The objection which had been raised that this compensation would ultimately fall upon the wages of the men, was a mere supposition, and he did not think it was a supposition likely to be indorsed by that House. It seemed to him quite contrary to experience, and it certainly was incapable of proof. The rate of wages in Germany had gone up, and not down, since the system of compensation was introduced. It seemed to him that there was only one condition in which it was likely that this charge would fall upon the earnings of the men. That was in the case of a business in which the sale price of an article was cut down to the lowest possible level in order to meet foreign competition, and where that price could not be raised without succumbing to that foreign competition—where the cost of production was so slightly below the sale price that an employer would rather give up business altogether than suffer any further diminution of his profits. In that case, and in that case only, where the cost of the insurance could not be got out of the employer's pocket, and where it could not be got out of the consumers' pockets, was it likely to fall upon the wages of the workmen. These cases were comparatively few, and, so far as German competition was concerned, they must always bear in mind that already German

trade bore this charge without any detriment. He only wished to refer to one other argument, namely, that a system of general insurance would weaken the inducement to an employer to take precautions for the safety of his men. In the first place, that seemed to take a precious low view of employers, and, in the next place, Sir Frederick Pollock, in a note in the Report of the Labour Commission, declared that no proof had been adduced of avoidable negligence on the part of employers, and added:—

> "If such proof could be produced, it was the criminal rather than the civil law which ought to be strengthened to meet such a case."

It was quite clear that proper safeguards against accidents was a matter for Factory Acts, Merchant Shipping Acts, and other legislation of that character, and was not a matter to mix up and confuse with demands for compensation. But, admitting that there were employers who would be likely to expose their workmen to unnecessary risk, surely the one way by which they could influence such men as that was by getting at their pockets, and the increased premium which the insurance companies would impose upon them would soon induce a better frame of mind. The object of the Bill, he took it, was to make the pecuniary interest of an employer to safeguard his men the same as the interest of the men in securing that safety. He thought it was reasonable to assume that the very effect of insurance would be to compel in the direction of prevention. He did not wish to lay any stress upon this point, because, whatever system of employers' liability they adopted, it was not likely that it would materially influence the question of prevention of accidents. The subject of precaution against accidents and of compensation for injuries arising from accidents, were two distinct issues, and should be treated as distinct. But, since the late Home Secretary introduced his Employers' Liability Bill, he maintained that the evidence received as to the effect of the working of the German system tended to show that, on the whole, it had acted for the prevention and not the increase of accidents. The present law as it now stood was admittedly defective. It did not provide for one quarter of the accidents which were an inevitable accompaniment of modern methods of industry, and, even where a workman had got a claim against his employer, he was obliged to enforce it by legal action, which was a perfect pitfall for the unwary litigant. To abolish the doctrine of common employment was to leave untouched one-half of the accidents which occurred now, and merely to remove one out of five legal defences which could be made to an action under the Employers' Liability Act. He would remind the House that Sir Godfrey Lushington, in the Report of the Labour Commission—and he was not likely to be prejudiced against the existing state of the law—condemned the whole principle upon which our system of employers' liability was founded. He pointed out the terrors of litigation to workmen; the gross unfairness to workmen that they should have to prove negligence on the part of their employers; and he concluded:—

> "It is quite unsuitable as a remedy to meet the common case of a trifling injury which befalls a workman in the course of his employment, and results in his temporary disablement."

As he understood this Bill, the House was asked to declare in favour of a system which would be more humane than the present system, because it would give a more certain means of compensation. The Bill, he agreed, was capable of amendment; but he hoped that whatever length of time it took to discuss and perfect it in Committee, the House would not get up before it had resolved that it should pass into law. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. ANDREW PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said there was one point which wanted clearing up to some extent, namely, whether they were debating how to provide compensation for injury, or how to prevent accidents. They ought to make up their minds what sort of a Bill they wanted, because it was certain that a Bill compensating for accidents could not be also a Bill for preventing accidents, except indirectly, by means of its penalties. However, if that were so, this Bill would operate in a much stronger way for the prevention of accidents than any which had preceded it. The Bill of 1893 would only have reached one accident in ten, and even with the doctrine of common employment set aside, the Bill would only have doubled the number of cases that would have been compensated. The present Bill proposed that all accidents in the included trades were to be compensated for, and it would be five times more powerful than the 1893 Bill in the way of prevention. No Employers' Liability Bill had dealt directly with the prevention of accidents. The Bill backed up by the hon. Members for Battersea, Normanton, and Morpeth contained nothing of the kind. It dealt with compensation only. It was perfectly clear, then, that all the Legislature had done to prevent accidents hitherto had been done by special Acts—such as the Mines, Factories, and Quarries Acts. The Bill of 1893 provided many facilities for going to law against the employer; but if there was anything clearly proved by experience under the Act of 1880, it was that workmen could get no benefit from the Law Courts. That was shown by the result of the actions brought under the Act. There was an impression in the minds of workmen not only that all accidents, or nearly all, were preventible, but that a very large number, if not the whole of them, were caused by the employers. The available records showed that the result was quite the contrary. The only recognised record was the Return of convictions of employers and employed under the Regulation of Mines Act. The figures showed that during last year seven owners or managers of mines were convicted of offences connected with safety-lamp explosions. On the other hand, the number of workmen convicted of such offences was 65, while 59 were convicted of neglecting to set sprags and blocks, 44 of offences in connection with the use of explosives, and 137 of carrying matches and smoking in mines. The Return, therefore, showed that the number of workmen convicted of offences was largely in excess of the number of offences proved against employers. Prevention, it was clear, must be carried out in some other way than by the imposition of penalties for the contravention of some particular Act. Workmen and their leaders seemed to have a strong feeling that they could get advantage under an Act of Parliament by going to law. They had encouraged it in every form. Even the Bill just introduced on their behalf gave every facility for going to law, but it did nothing for the prevention of accidents in any other way. The Secretary for the Colonies had told them that in the actions tried under the Employers' Liability Act in England the compensation awarded averaged about £41 per action. That was bad enough. But the figures respecting Scotland were so bad that, candidly, he believed it would have been much better for the workmen if there had never been any Employers' Liability Bill at all. In 14 years after the passing of the Act of 1881, there were 1,762 actions tried in Scotland, in which £363,000 was claimed, but only £17,500 was awarded, which was only 5 per cent. It was certain the workmen of Scotland must have paid that amount in costs. He mentioned these things to show the worthlessness of going to law either to obtain compensation for workmen or to discourage employers and others from causing accidents. It would have no effect at all in making either employer or workman more careful. Nobody was benefited except the lawyers; indeed, in all the Bills brought before the House before this the chief, if not the sole, interest protected was the interest of the lawyers. Another reason for calling attention to this was that he wanted the right hon. Gentleman to take into his careful consideration the question of costs. If the arbitrations under the Bill were to be conducted as arbitrations were usually conducted in this country—say before an official referee—then a workman had better face an ordinary trial. He hoped such rules would be made as would prevent the piling up of enormous costs against those who referred their cases to arbitration. The right hon. Gentleman had mentioned that the fees would be paid by the Government; but those who knew anything of County Court practice knew that the fees were a microscopic part of the total costs; and unless the right hon. Gentleman took care to protect litigants in cases of this kind, he felt certain that he would have to come again to the House, perhaps even to abolish arbitration altogether, and set up some simpler and easier method of arriving at a settlement of the question between the parties. The right hon. Gentleman told them last night the number of accidents which he believed occurred in the industries affected under this Bill. No doubt, he had better opportunities for arriving at the numbers than himself. But, turning to the Census Returns, he found that there were 17 millions of working men in this country, and of these four millions were working on their own account, while about 13 millions were employed by others. There were employed in callings with little risk seven millions; with some risk two and a half millions; and in more or less dangerous callings about three and a half millions. There were two employments which he would ask the Home Secretary to include, namely, workmen engaged in the manufacture, storage, and transportation of explosives, and men who were employed in occupations connected with horses, carriers, coachmen, waggoners, carters, and farriers, numbering altogether about 400,000. This work was dangerous, and the men were unable to combine for protection, with anything like the strength and cohesion possible in most other trades. The Home Secretary had been asked if he would introduce a separate Act to deal with sailors, but he had not given an answer. It was to deal with dangerous callings that this Bill was introduced, and going to sea was the most dangerous of all callings; being, according to the Official Returns, five times more fatal than mining. Sailors were already protected to some extent in several foreign countries, but so far nothing had been done for them here, and they were unable to combine to protect their own interests as they led a too scattered life, and obtaining evidence in case of accident to them was almost an impossibility. The Bill contained anomalies and inequalities, and there was no doubt that the position of workmen who were excluded would become intolerable under the Act of 1880. The Home Secretary promised the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife to consider an Amendment repealing the doctrine of common employment as applying to all workmen excluded from this Bill. He himself hoped the Home Secretary would also accept Amendments dealing with contributory negligence, or of a workman having knowledge of a defect in the plant which afterwards might have led to an accident, as innumerable actions have been defeated by these defences. Then the Act of 1880 should be amended to the extent of making all negligent employers liable, and not as at present only employers who personally directed the workmen. The notice of injury should also be extended from six weeks up to, say, three months. While the scale of compensation in the Bill might be considered as satisfactory, as no objection had been taken to it in any quarter of the House, it would be unfair to apprentices, as a young man during the last year or two of his apprenticeship would have very small wages, while immediately his time had expired, his wages might be doubled, or become even higher. He believed the Government would have on this point to amend the Bill. As the Bill stood it would be an inducement for employers to engage bachelors, widowers, and men without children in order to escape the consequences of the Act. Should it prove that there were no dependents, the money could be applied to some fund for which use might be found hereafter. Sub-contractors were also left out of the present Bill, and these should be dealt with as they were in the Bill of 1893. He thought with regard to insurance that it must be made compulsory that a workman should have his compensation secured, otherwise cases would arise in which he would not receive anything. The contracting out clause would lead to the extension of Accident Relief Funds, such as were now carried on by many large companies employing many workmen, but small works would be unable to have such Funds with safety; and it was likely that the Registrar of Friendly Societies would not certify for small works with few men employed. In the case of coal mines, insurance must be compulsory, unless the whole of the coal industries of the country combined for mutual insurance, as all the men in any coal pit might be killed by a single accident. Between 1860 and 1891 there were 30 mine accidents in which 4,100 lives were lost. The owners of many of these would have been quite unable to pay compensation, and therefore mine owners must either combine for mutual insurance, or be required to insure with insurance companies; otherwise the miners would have no security for compensation in case of accident. He could not, however, see how every case will be met, unless some Government scheme of management or regulation were created. The insurance offices expended 40 per cent. or 50 per cent. of their premiums in management charges, whereas the London and North Western Railway Company managed their fund for 4 per cent. Mutual trade arrangements could be carried out for as little, and with Government management the work could be done for less. If employers were compelled to insure with companies it will in effect tax their industries for almost twice as much as insurance could be effected for in other ways. Labour representatives had always opposed insurance. In 1886 in a Committee upstairs, they tried to make insurance impossible. An Amendment was proposed which would have made it penal on the part of an employer to insure, and this was repeated at a subsequent Committee. Of course, these Amendments were not accepted, and did not appear in the Bills when they came back to the House. The contention was that it would weaken the trades unions, and also that it would remove the necessity for care by the employer. That was an entire mistake All insurance meant increased security—[Mr. Havelock Wilson: "Not in ships!"]—and greater care. This was true of marine insurance as regarded ships, and fire insurance as regarded houses. Both ships and houses were much better and safer built at the present time than they ever were, and they were so because, in the case of ships, they were compelled to be built in conformity with rules laid down by Lloyds. This remark also applied to companies that did not insure their ships. They must, like the others, build up to the standard or beyond it, for the reason that if they did not do so, no one would ship cargo. Every shipper had to put his goods in a vessel in which he could insure. Therefore, in order to obtain freight, every vessel must be built in conformity with the rules laid down by the representatives of the insurance offices. A word as to the distribution of compensation. It would lead to waste if widows of workmen received in one sum £150 or £200. It would appear to them unlimited wealth, probably never in their lives having known what it was to have as much as £5. The Government should do all that was possible to retain the Miners' Permanent Relief Societies in existence, as their machinery met such cases by paying allowances weekly to widows and children. If these societies were permitted to die out, their machinery could not be recreated. The present Bill was admittedly imperfect, and would require much amendment in Committee. The Government could complete all necessary inquiries during this Session, and take it as the first Bill next Session. It would then become law on the 30th April 1898, which would make only four months delay, and this would furnish opportunities of making it a better Act.

*Mr. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): When this Bill was first introduced I ventured, on behalf of many of those who sat on this side of the House, to assure Her Majesty's Government that it would be received by us not in the spirit of party controversy, and that its provisions would be examined in a fair and sympathetic temper. Those anticipations, it must be admitted, have been more than realised by the course and character of this Debate. ["Hear, hear!"] And in the brief observations which I shall address to the House—for it is extremely desirable that we should compress our speeches into a somewhat more moderate compass than has been done in one or two cases—[*cheers*]—I shall speak as one who is not only prepared to accept the principle of the Bill, but is desirous in various ways to extend its scope and to strengthen its safeguards. Let me say at the outset that I do not share in the least the apprehensions which have been expressed in more than one quarter that legislation on these lines—developed, as it must be in the course of time, far beyond the comparatively limited area of this Bill—is likely to impose an insuperable, or indeed a serious, burden upon the industries of this country. As an hon. Member opposite has reminded us, there has not been one single stage of the long and beneficent series of enactments for the protection of the life and health of the working population at which similar vaticinations have not been uttered with the same lugubrious confidence. ["Hear, hear!"] But happily there is not one case which can be produced where those forecasts have not been falsified. ["Hear, hear!"] I am myself certain that among the many new and formidable dangers with which undoubtedly British trade is in these days confronted, our industry is not only not unfavourably handicapped in the race with the rest of the world, but it has enjoyed great and distinct advantages, resulting directly and indirectly from the legislation shortening the hours of labour and improving the conditions under which our industrial life is carried on. ["Hear, hear!"] One other thing. I do not see—and I never have seen—the incompatibility, from the point of principle, which appears to suggest itself to the minds of some hon. Gentlemen between proposals such as those which some of us were engaged in promoting three or four years ago, for the amendment of the law of employers' liability, and the proposals now before the House. They aim at different, but at perfectly reconcileable and perfectly consistent, objects. The primary purpose—although people may differ as to the method—of legislation as to employers' liability is, by fixing a direct personal responsibility on the employer for taking all precautions which skill and foresight can suggest against accident, to raise the average level of safety. The primary purpose of compensation, on the other hand, is to secure that every one who is engaged in what is called "the army of industry," shall, if he is wounded or if his life is cut short, have secured to him and those dependent on him, an adequate provision to meet the necessities of the case. These are different objects, but they are quite compatible one with the other, and I do not see why they should not be pursued at the same time. ["Hear, hear!"] A great deal of reference has been made to the German system. In common with most of those who are interested in industrial questions, I have watched that system pretty closely during the past few years. If I had to state my own opinion of it, I think I should find myself almost midway between the conflicting views of its champions and its critics. But I desire to point out that the German system has nothing to do with the proposals in this Bill, which is framed on entirely different lines. In the conception and in the drafting of the Government's Measure, it is perfectly clear that they have deliberately and for reasons which seemed good to themselves, abjured the German example. The German system is a perfectly logical attempt to combine the two objects which I have described. On the one hand, it does secure to the workman not only a title to, but an absolute assurance that he will receive compensation; because it does not make his enjoyment of compensation dependent on the solvency of his employer, but enables him to have recourse to the whole industrial group to which that employer belongs. On the other hand, the German system aims also at those objects which we have endeavoured to pursue in our law relating to employers' liability. It has a "danger tariff" as it is called—a system under which a higher levy of contribution is exacted for the common fund from the employer who, from the prevalence of accidents in his works, there is ground for believing does not take proper precautions. In the present Bill these features are not reproduced. As regards prevention, as my right hon. Friend very frankly stated, the Bill does not propose to make any change in the existing law, except to the extent that, when the employer has to compensate the workman for all accidents, he will be under an inducement to curtail the area of preventable accidents in order to reduce his total liability. But the Bill makes no direct proposals on the subject, and does not, like the German system, penalise the employer, apart from the compensation which he has to pay, if he is proved to be guilty of exceptional want of care. Still more remarkable and significant is the departure of the Bill from the German example in the character of the security which it gives to the workman for compensation. Do not let it be supposed for a moment that I am quarrelling in this respect with the lines which the Government have pursued. The German system may be very well suited to the economic and social conditions of that country, but its adoption here—resting as it does on the double foundation of compulsory grouping and centralised control—would require us to fly in the face of the traditions and the living tendencies of British industry. [*Cheers.*] I thought that the Government were perfectly right in discarding that feature of the German system, although it must be admitted that in so doing they have been obliged to deprive the workman of a security which, under the German system, he does undoubtedly enjoy. Let us see how it works out. It is said that under this Bill the employers will insure. I believe that in a large number of cases they will, though there is no obligation to do so. In the textile trades, where the premium paid at present for insuring employers' liability is so trifling as to be an insignificant item in the cost of production, the burden thrown on the employer, even if that premium were multiplied five or ten fold by the Bill, would still be very small; and I do not doubt that in that large industry insurance will be very generally resorted to. But there are other trades in which you cannot predict with the same certainty that that will be the case. I mean, for instance, the building trade and coal mining. Take a case which I am sure is possible and even probable. Take the case of a coal mine in South Wales—one of those dangerous areas where, as we know, however great the precautions taken by the manufacturer, there is a natural and unforeseeable liability to disaster. Many of them are owned by limited companies of which the whole of the capital is paid up. I do not believe that any of the insurance companies would insure an employer in that position against the risks of explosion; but, whether or not, I am certain that the premium which would have to be paid for such an insurance would be so large, and would be such a heavy burden on an industry in which the margin of profit had reached almost the vanishing point, that the owner would rather depend on "the chapter of accidents" than avail himself of that insurance. Then what happens? Sooner or later the explosion takes place and perhaps 200 lives are lost. The minimum payment under the Bill is £30,000, and it may rise to £60,000. What becomes of the workmen? The concern goes into liquidation and the workman has a right of proof, for what it is worth, and I may say that there is no form of litigation so unsatisfactory as carrying in a proof in bankruptcy. The workmen may get a farthing or at the outside sixpence in the pound. Here I beg to assure the House I am putting no imaginary case, but one which is very likely to occur—["hear, hear!"]—and one cannot ignore the probability that the existence of a statutory obligation of this kind will tend to encourage the conversion of many businesses at present carried on by private partnerships into limited companies, thereby, of course, reducing the margin which would be available for compensation to workmen in the event of one of these inevitable disasters. I am sure that Her Majesty's Government and those who support them will agree that this is a very serious state of things, and as long as that is possible it cannot be said that we have solved the question of compensation for accidents. It may be said, What suggestions have you to make? I repeat that I think the Government were right in the first instance in trying the experiment of making the individual employer liable. But I am certain that when you have made that experiment you will find that you will be led to lengths which some people hardly anticipate. [*Cheers.*] Let us fully realise where we are going. If you once establish the principle that if a soldier in the army of industry is wounded or dies he is entitled in the one case to a pension, and in the other case that his dependents are to be provided for, you cannot leave the application of that principle to the hazard of chance, as to whether the captain of his company is solvent or insolvent. The liability you recognise rests not upon the ground that the employer is morally responsible; it rests on the ground that this is one of the burdens incidental to the trade, and that it is a matter of general interest that men should not be left unprovided for who have devoted the best of their energies to the carrying on of industries of the country. As a matter of convenience you may make the employer the person whose pocket is in the first instance to be resorted to; but when that pocket is empty, and when the workman who has sustained a great injury is unable to obtain compensation from him, you will have to provide another fund for the purpose. I like to look questions of this kind fairly in the face, and I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion, when we have passed this Bill into law, we shall have practically committed ourselves to a system by which out of State resources you will have to guarantee compensation for accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] I pass from that to say a word on the subject of the introduction of additional safeguards for the prevention of accidents. I was glad to hear the assurance of the Home Secretary last night that whilst he deprecated making the Bill too complicated a Measure, if it were found consistent with not unduly enlarging its area, he would introduce safety provisions, or at any rate keep an open mind on the subject. The point which I would press upon the Government is that they ought to take this opportunity of abolishing once and for all as regards all the industries of the country the doctrine of common employment. ["Hear, hear!"] That doctrine has had a curious history. It was the invention of lawyers. Seventeen years ago, when the first Employers' Liability Bill was passed, the doctrine of common employment was taken for granted by everybody as being a sound and well-founded principle, and it was regarded as rather a heretical thing to throw doubt upon it. But now there is no one so poor as to do it reverence. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] No one has adduced a single argument in favour of the maintenance of the doctrine of common employment. ["Hear, hear!"] The Colonial Secretary has said that as regards these selected industries we are getting rid of the doctrine. I do not think that that statement is literally accurate. It is perfectly true that as regards a man in the selected trades who chooses to prefer his claim to compensation under the schedule of this Bill no question of common employment can arise. But there is an important provision in the Bill to which very little attention has been directed, namely, subparagraph B of Sub-section 2, Clause 1—[*cheers*]—which gives the alternative right to the person injured to pursue, subject to certain conditions, his legal remedy. I confess I do not understand the language of that clause any more than I do astrology. [*Laughter.*] What is the meaning of "wilful and wrongful act of the employer"? How you are going to draw a line between what the Home Secretary called "gross negligence" and the "wilful act of the employer" I do not know; and as this is one of the matters that have compulsorily to be referred to arbitration before the workman can bring his action in a Court of Law, it seems to me a clause which will give rise to a great deal of unnecessary litigation. Let us suppose a case which will commonly occur. A man is not killed, but is seriously injured by an accident. He loses a finger, an eye, or a limb, but he

Mr. H. H. Asquith.

is not in a condition of incapacity, which alone is contemplated and provided for in the schedule of the Bill. He can work, but he works in a mutilated and crippled condition and at a less remunerative form of employment. As I read the Bill I do not think it makes any provision for that case. But even if it did, the man may believe that he would get a larger solatium by his legal remedy than in this modest amount—"a weekly payment not exceeding 50 per cent of his wages." ["Hear, hear!"] The moment a man goes to law, although he belongs to one of the selected industries, he may be met by the defence of common employment, and if the injury can be shown in any degree to be due to the default of a fellow workman he cannot obtain a remedy. ["Hear, hear!"] I say then that, even as regards the selected trades, my right hon. Friend went beyond what is provided in the Bill when he said that the doctrine of common employment had no application. But as regards the non-selected trades the law remains as it has been for the past 17 years—a scandal and a reproach to the Legislature—["hear, hear!"]—an elaborate series of traps and pitfalls for the unwary litigant, and producing litigation which in proportion to its difficulty and cost is absolutely barren of result. ["Hear, hear!"] By a few words introduced into the Bill the Government may get rid of the doctrine of common employment and confer an incalculable boon upon the large body of workmen who are otherwise excluded from its operation. ["Hear, hear!"] With regard to exclusions from the Bill, I do not deny that there is something to be said for proceeding tentatively in the working out of a matter of this kind; but I cannot understand or appreciate the grounds upon which the Government have proceeded in their discrimination between favoured and unfavoured trades. The main ground alleged is that in selected trades the percentage of accidents is higher than in the others. That I believe is open to doubt. It certainly is very high in the case of certain trades of a dangerous character which are excluded from the scope of the Bill. But I venture emphatically to protest against the use, or rather the abuse, of the doctrine of averages in matters of this kind. It is no consolation to a mine-owner, who has to work a dangerous mine and who is called upon to make good the results of an explosion by which two or three hundred persons are killed, to say that the average cost of this new charge on capital is 1 per cent. of the coal industry of the country. ["Hear, hear!"] But if that is the case as regards the owner, how far stronger is the case as regards the workman who is injured? Here is a man, we will say, a builder, who falls from a scaffold on a building where steam power is not used and breaks his arm or his leg, and is incapacitated from carrying on his business by which he gets his living. The doctrine of common employment stands in the way of his getting anything out of his employer if it is shown that a fellow workman has been guilty of contributory negligence, and he cannot get a halfpenny under the Bill because he does not happen to belong to one of the privileged trades. You go to such a man and say to him, "My poor friend, I am very sorry for you. It is quite true that you have been crippled and mutilated for life, and that your value as an instrument of production has been depreciated to an extent that cannot be estimated. But you are only one case in a thousand. Your more fortunate neighbour next door, who, having sustained a similar injury, has got a pension for life, belongs to a trade where he is one in fifty or in a hundred." [*Cheers.*] There cannot possibly be any policy or justice in that discrimination. ["Hear, hear!"] I am not making these criticisms in any hostile spirit, because I am anxious if I can, as we all are in respect to this Bill, to make it a complete and workable Measure, and, above all, that it shall not be a Bill which, by introducing new and invidious distinctions between different classes of workmen, could give rise to jealousy and heartburning, and prove anything but a settlement of the great questions which we all wish to settle. [*Cheers.*] I therefore earnestly trust that the Government will reconsider the exclusion of these trades, some of which, for instance, such as the trade of seamen, are peculiarly dangerous. ["Hear, hear!"] I should like to mention two other points. The first is as to the question, who under the Bill is to be deemed to be an employer—a question which was raised by one of my hon. Friends on this side. Now, Sir, everyone who has had to study this matter with a view to practical legislation has very soon found himself confronted with this difficulty. In our law, if the employer delegates a part of the work which he has contracted to do by contract to another, and allows that other to employ the workmen, between that head employer and the workmen there is no contractual relation whatever. Thus, if you give to the workman a remedy against the employer, he must pursue it against the middleman and not against the head man, for whose behalf and profit the contract is really being carried out. In other words, you are brought face to face with the question of sub-contracting. If this Bill be passed in its present form, it will give an enormous impetus to sub-contracting. We know that sub-contracting already exists to a very considerable extent in mines, where a great deal of the incidental work is done under butty men or gangers—by small gangs of men whom they select and pay. These men are not, in point of law, in the employment of the mine-owner, and any remedy given to them against their employer would only be against this man—I will not call him a man of straw, but a man with no adequate means of making good the compensation which it is your intention to give. You must deal with that question if this Bill is to be a satisfactory Bill, and I venture upon that point to press upon the Government the desirability of incorporating, as they can, I think, without the least change in the structure of their Bill, by a mere addition, the clause we succeeded in introducing into the Employers' Liability Bill of 1893. In that clause, under certain well-defined conditions, the main one of which was that the head employer must have control of the operations or of the premises upon which the work has been carried on, you would make the head employer liable, and not the intermediary alone, whose liability would be of no value whatever to the injured man. There is another point also involving no change whatever in the principle of the Bill, and very little change in its structure. It was brought forward with admirable wealth of apposite illustration by my hon. Friend the Member for Berwickshire. In the first subsection of all, which entitles an injured man to compensation for injury arising from accident, you should either by the introduction of words into that clause, or by definition or, if needed, by a separate and independent clause, import into the scope of the Bill injuries to health which are caused by neglect on the part of the employer to take those sanitary precautions which are essential for the well-being of the workmen. [*Cheers.*] As my hon. Friend pointed out there are a very large number of cases, particularly in dangerous trades, such as the lead, pottery, and other industries, in which people living in an insidious atmosphere day by day and week by week are slowly poisoned, lose their health, very often become victims of paralysis, and are rendered quite incapable of carrying on industrial operations. These men and these women—for they are very largely women—are as much wounded soldiers who have fallen on one side in the march of this great army of industry as the man who has his arm or his leg broken in one of the trades dealt with by the Bill. [*Cheers.*] I confess that no Measure to secure compensation is to my mind adequate or satisfactory which does not bring them within this scope. I have confined myself to matters that seemed to me of vital importance, which go down to the very roots of the question, and I end as I began, by saying that I trust that when the Bill reaches the Committee stage we shall find the Government willing to consider and accede to the suggestions, such as those I have ventured to put forward, conceived not in any spirit of hostility to the Bill, but in the honest desire to extend its scope, within such limits as are reasonable and just, and to make it a satisfactory Measure. [*Cheers.*]

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight) said it was a great pleasure to him to find himself in accord with the right hon. Gentleman in regard to many of the observations he had made, although he must criticise some of the right hon. Gentleman's arguments. He was satisfied that they were not addressed to the House in any spirit of hostility. The main objection which had been raised to the Bill was that it would impose a burden on the great colliery industry. Hon. Members who represented colliery interests, however, had proceeded on inaccurate data, and upon premises which would not bear the test of even a superficial examination. The calculation of the hon. Member for Gainsborough that the liability thrown upon the colliery owners by this Bill would amount to 2d, a ton, or even more, and would be an almost intolerable burden, was not a calculation upon which the House could act, because no one who had considered the question during the last 10 or 15 years could possibly assume that the existing law was to be allowed to continue to be the standard of the liability of the colliery owners. What they ought to do in order to fairly gauge the real burden imposed on any industry by the Bill was to take the best position which that industry could hope for under the altered legislation which they must expect. The Bill of the right hon. Gentleman opposite gave the best terms which the colliery owner could have been asked to expect, and yet not a single Member in the course of that Debate had attempted to fix what would have been the standard of liability imposed by that Bill. That Measure would have put an end to the doctrine of common employment so far as collieries were concerned, it would have made the coal owner liable in every case in which a workman was injured by reason of the negligence of any person in the service of the employer. He asked hon. Members who might follow him to say how much of the hundreds of thousands of pounds ought to be deducted in the case of colliery proprietors who had a good defence. He did not hesitate to say from his own experience that, taking the standard of liability which would be imposed by the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman and the standard imposed by this Bill, only a fraction of increased liability—it might be 10, 15, or 20 per cent. at the outside—would be due to the fact that the colliery proprietor had to compensate in every case of accident in which the workman had been guilty of contributory negligence. No doubt many hon. Members opposite at the last election were prepared to accept the Bill of the right hon. Member for Fife, and if so to consent to have imposed upon themselves as employers of labour a liability which he believed would be 50, 60, or even 70 per cent. of the liability imposed by this Bill. In order to ascertain what was the real burden, they must contrast the existing state of things with what would have been the change in the law and the increased liability had the Bill of 1893 been passed. A word with reference to the inclusion or exclusion of all trades or the limited inclusion under the present Bill. Here he could not quite agree with the argument of the right hon. Member for East Fife. To his own mind, remembering that the Government were enunciating a principle which, if not altogether new, went further in regard to these trades than the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman, it was necessary to proceed with caution. To include all trades at once in this system he believed he could show was impossible. Upon what basis had the Government proceeded? The first broad principle that they had proceeded upon was to include trades that were either dangerous or involved such conditions that legislation had been necessary to control the manner and safeguards under which they were carried out. With regard to engineering works they advanced further. Then they had to consider the practical conditions which affected those industries, and he would take one or two of the most typical matters that had been referred to. Take the building trade. What was the condition of that trade as a whole? Apart from the vast structures reared in London and other large cities by the aid of costly machinery, the bulk of the work done was in relation to comparatively small buildings which did not involve the same elements of danger. Here small employers were for the most part little better off than the foreman and superior workmen who worked on the job, and if at one sweep, without experience of how it would work, they were to include the whole of the building trade, they would simply drag in and put under the conditions of this Bill a class of men who could not combine to protect themselves and ought not to be called upon to insure and pay compensation for injuries of men who were practically in the same position as themselves. Take domestic servants. No Bill would be necessary for domestic servants such as hon. Members would employ. If any of their servants were injured in their employment he was sure they would not allow them to remain without the means of subsistence. But with small people, in the small habitations of our towns, employing one or two servants it was different. It would be ridiculous that persons with incomes varying between £100 and £200 a year should have imposed upon them by statute the liability to compensate servants for accidents that might happen in the course of their ordinary employment. Take the case of small trades—smiths', ironworkers', and carpenters' shops and tens of trades of that kind, in hundreds and thousands of instances they would find they would be obliged, if they included all trades, to bring in persons little better than superior workmen. It was necessary to draw the line somewhere, and accordingly the line was drawn at these trades in which there would not be the same hardship and burden which would be likely to cripple industry and to be a serious detriment to the carrying on of the trades. As to the power of employers of labour in the larger industries to combine and protect themselves, in the shipping trade there existed mutual associations whereby shipowners combined for the purpose of meeting the demands of the workmen and protecting themselves; and with regard to colliery proprietors and other large industries there were the same means of mutual assistance and co-operation. This was not the case with the small employers throughout the length and breadth of the land, so the Government had proceeded on lines which the House might think right or wrong, but which were still intelligible, intended to include dangerous trades, and trades where the power of mutual protection and insurance was readily accessible to those engaged in them, and which would not impose an unreasonable burden on small employers, who were often in no better case than their superior workmen. When in Committee they came to consider whether the actual provisions of Section 2 were sufficient to bring in dangerous trades, the matter would, he was sure, be carefully considered; but in considering the Amendments and the action of the Government with regard to them, it was necessary they should keep in view the principles to which he had referred, that they might not, without experience and foresight, include trades which, in practical working, it would be found undesirable to bring within the scheme and the Bill. Now he came to the main point of the attack of the right hon. Member for Fife. He asked, "Why have you not abolished the doctrine of common employment altogether?" He could not understand the construction he placed on sub-section (3) of Clause 2. He could not imagine the question of common employment arising in a case under that section. If the employer had been guilty of such gross personal negligence as to render him liable to compensate a workman in damages, no question of common employment could possibly arise. But he would not debate points not necessarily for the purpose of the Bill. A great deal had been said which was not well founded in attacking the doctrine of common employment. But he was not there to defend it. Still there was much more to be said for it than his right hon. Friend indicated in his speech. But as regarded the trades included in the Bill, it was abolished altogether. He unhesitatingly submitted that if they had determined to proceed gradually, and if it was necessary not at once to include every trade, but to select trades to which such a principle as this could be safely applied, then, as to the trades included in the Bill, the doctrine of common employment had no more to be considered. Several hon. Gentlemen had asked:—

> "Why, when you contemplate compensation for injuries, have you not at the same time endeavoured to prevent accidents?"

When he remembered the legislation proposed in 1893, it astonished him that such an argument could be used on the other side of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] All that the Bill of 1893 did from this point of view was to abolish the doctrine of common employment and to make the master liable for injury done to a workman as he would have been to a person outside. If it was true that this Bill, in the case of the selected trades, imposed a greater liability on the employer than the Bill of 1893, to that greater extent there was a stronger inducement to prevent accidents, and he did think it was hardly a fair argument for hon. Members opposite to say that by the proposed legislation of 1893 they directed their attention mainly to the prevention of accidents. All they did was to make the master responsible in a greater number of cases. ["Hear, hear!"] The present Government had gone further, and if the trades included under the Bill were dangerous trades, they had applied a stronger preventive against accidents in the proposals now before the House than was contained in the proposals of 1893. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had dwelt a good deal on what might happen in the event of the bankruptcy of an employer. He did not deny that that was a difficult question, but it existed to a great extent at the present time. Employers were just as likely to go bankrupt when an action was brought against them as they would be under the provisions of this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] But that question could not be dealt with as a matter of principle. He did not suppose the House would care to say that the State should provide a fund out of which compensation might be paid to the workman. He did not suppose the House would be prepared to adopt the German system. The question of solvency and ability to pay damages was just one of those chances of fortune to which persons employed in trades must at times be subjected. ["Hear, hear!"] He would be glad if some system could be devised which would afford security to the workman, but it did not seem to be possible to remove all risk that might arise. There was one suggestion he would throw out, though he did not do so on behalf of the Government. It seemed to him that if there was anxiety as to the ability of the employer to continue the weekly payments, an alternative might be inserted by providing for the payment of a lump sum. He heard his hon. Friend the late Solicitor General suggest that in that case the employer might "go bang at once." [*Laughter.*] But that might happen at the present day, and if an employer could not pay when an accident happened, that was a misfortune which might arise at the present time. ["Hear, hear!"] It seemed to him that the possibility of future insolvency might be met by some such Amendment as he had suggested. He did not think very much reliance could be placed on the argument that there ought to be included in the Bill some provision against injuries arising from dangerous trades. He was a little surprised to hear the hon. Member for Berwickshire claim credit on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife for having provided for compensation for injuries arising from employment in dangerous trades, in his Bill of 1893. There was no such provision in the Bill.

*MR. ASQUITH: We assented to it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said the only suggestion was to provide for compensation for injuries to health which could be mitigated or removed by the use of reasonable precautions. But a large number of those injuries arise, not from the neglect of precautions, but from the trade itself; therefore it was no good to suggest that provisions should be included in this Bill for the compensation of workmen who, in the ordinary course of trade, lost their health, when the only suggestion made in the Bill of 1893 was to compensate the workman for loss or injury if it was occasioned by the neglect of reasonable precautions. He would not argue the Bill in reference to such occurrences as the great explosions in mines. He hoped that they would become rarer year by year; but they had to deal with the everyday occurrences and accidents which must arise, and he trusted the House would feel that the Government had endeavoured at any rate to adopt a principle which, whether it were extended or not, would commend itself to those who desired to compensate workmen in the trades included. If, in the course of years, with the better knowledge the House would gain from the working of this Measure, it could be extended, so much the better. If it promoted insurance, it would mean greater security in the trades, for the precautions taken by insurers and insurance companies led to the reduction of accidents. The Government had adopted a principle which they believed to be sound in itself. They had applied it to those industries which, in their judgment, called for an alteration in the law. If they had not gone far enough, the House could amend the actual list of trades to which it ought to apply. Certainly, in his opinion, it ought not to apply generally without distinction to all employers. The Bill was an honest attempt to deal with the question, and he sincerely hoped the House would continue the discussion on the Committee stage in the same spirit which had been displayed on the present occasion, and that they would be able to see at the end of the Session a useful Measure on the Statute Book, which would not only prevent accidents, but also compensate those who were injured through no fault of their own. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said he could wish to see the Bill amended in more points than one, but it was his intention to vote for the Second Reading, because he considered it, on the whole, a great advance on any proposal that had hitherto come from the Party opposite. He also supported the Bill because, during the last 16 years, the firm with which he was connected had paid compensation exactly in the way the Bill proposed. ["Hear, hear!"] He had to congratulate the House on the tone in which the Home Secretary had met what they had to say in the way of criticism. Whenever they heard the right hon. Gentleman they listened to a man who gave them the impression that, whether they differed from him or not, he was kindly disposed towards them, and would meet their objections if they were not opposed to the principles on which he based his political conduct. "Hear, hear!"] Unfortunately that was not so in the case of all speakers from the Treasury Bench. ["Hear, hear!"] For the last 16 years his firm had been paying compensation exactly in the way proposed by the Bill. During that time they had not spent any money whatever in legal expenses under the Employers' Liability Act, and they had paid compensation in every case of injury without asking who was at fault, the workman or the employer. Moreover, they had never insured, for the reason that they expected the insurance company would pay as little as possible, and fight every case when there was a chance of defeating the workman. They desired that no such intermediary should come between them and their employees, on the ground that good relationship between them was extremely valuable and should be maintained. ["Hear, hear!"] He thought it worth while to mention that the legal definition of an accident is that the workman should be kept from his employment by his injuries 48 hours. In every case a report had been made to him personally by the head of the department in which the accident occurred, with a view to steps being taken to prevent a repetition of the accident. Some of the accidents arose from extraordinary causes. In one case a nut an inch and a-quarter across and $\frac{3}{8}$ inch deep caught a workman by his cotton jacket and took him round a shaft. During the four years 1881-4, the first years under the Employers' Liability Act, the number of accidents reported was 13 per 1,000 men per annum; but as a result of the pains to secure prevention the number was brought down to 6 per 1,000 per annum in the four years 1893-6. With respect to the proper method of dealing with drunken workmen, fifteen years ago his firm offered a reward for sobriety and regular attendance in the shape of a week's holiday every year and a week's pay, and at that time 43 per cent. of men were steady enough to earn the reward. Since then the number had risen to 98 per cent. ["Hear, hear!"] Although the hours of employment had been shortened from twelve to eight, this giving four hours a day longer for drinking, if the men were inclined to indulge in it, they were now far soberer than formerly. With regard to sub-contractors he agreed with Mr. Asquith that they were not as careful as the head employers, and for that reason, as well as for the reason that the sub-contractor was, as a rule, not able to pay compensation, he should be very glad to see the head contractor made responsible for the neglect of the sub-contractor. It was generally conceded that for this year at any rate agriculturists were to be left out of the scope of the Bill. He would like to point out that in the case of firms like his own, while they had to contribute to the maintenance in the workhouse of agricultural labourers who, often in consequence of receiving miserably small wages had been unable to provide for old age, they would have to maintain other agriculaural labourers who were accidentally injured and were unable to obtain compensation through the operation of the doctrine of common employment, and in addition would have this new liability thrown upon them of paying compensation in every case at their own works. If the accidents to agricultural labourers were small the liability also would be small. He very much feared that agriculture was left out mainly for the reason that the Tory Party considered that nobody engaged in agriculture ought to be obliged to put brains into their business. [*Laughter.*] The chief blots in the existing law mentioned by the hon. Member for East Fife would, he hoped, be dealt with in Committee by way of amendments. The Bill was described by its authors as a serious and earnest attempt to diminish litigation, but he would like to point out that in the first schedule it was provided that weekly payments made to a defendant might be revised every three months. A Bill which offered arbitration four times a year during the whole of a man's life could not fairly be described as an attempt to diminish litigation, for he looked upon arbitration as only another name for litigation. ["Hear, hear!"] Fear had been expressed that the Bill would tend to the extinction of small employers. He should be extremely sorry if that result came about. Small employers were a very valuable part of society. Their existence was an incentive to workmen to strive to improve their position, and they were a bulwark against that threatened condition of things in which every man would be either the paid servant of a limited company or would have to go to another country to earn his living. It would be a mischievous thing if all the trades of the country got into the hands of enormous organisations. The reason why it was feared the Bill would tend to extinction of small employers was, that small employers would find it impossible to insure against the liabilities imposed upon them. He should be grateful if he could be informed upon that point. With respect to the definition of "dependents," he had no doubt that if the Government would consider the matter for a moment they would allow a brother and a sister to come under the definition if it could be shown to the satisfaction of the arbitrator that that brother and sister had suffered loss by the injury or death of the workman. It appeared to him that, under the Bill as it stood, it was not necessary for the dependent to show that he or she suffered any loss through the injury or death of the workman. If that was so, they came to this absurd result. The definition of dependent under the Fatal Accidents Act 1846, included stepfather and stepmother, as well as grandfather and grandmother; stepson and stepdaughter, as well as son and daughter; so that if a stepson ran away and concealed himself as a workman in a factory, and met with an injury, his well-to-do stepmother, who suffered not one jot by the injury, might receive compensation.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think the schedule is clear, that under the Act of 1846 compensation can only be given where pecuniary loss is sustained. It is not intended for relations who do not suffer pecuniary injury.

*SIR J. BRUNNER said what he wished to impress upon the right hon. Gentleman was that nobody who did not suffer pecuniary loss should get compensation, and that anybody who did suffer should get compensation. He should support the Second Reading, because he considered the Bill was a considerable step in advance of previous legislation, because it tended to a thoroughly wholesome result, but mainly because for 16 years his firm had paid compensation on the lines it proposed.

*MR. EDWARD GOULDING (Wilts, Devizes) believed that this Measure would be received with great satisfaction by the working class, and especially by those members of that class who would benefit under its provisions, for whether in its aim at establishing compensation for accidents or in its endeavours to reduce the worry and uncertainty of litgation, it marked a great departure in legislation of that kind. The chief fault he had to find with the Bill was that so many trades were excluded from its operation. The Secretary for the Colonies, to whom so many were grateful for his powerful advocacy of social reforms, had said that the right to compensation of any person injured in the ordinary course of employment was a public right and a national obligation. Representing an agricultural constituency he claimed that right for them. This Parliament had already legislated for agriculture through the Agricultural Rates Act, which relieved the landlord and the tenant, but, so far, it had hardly done anything for the agricultural labourer, than whom there was no more deserving or law-abiding member of the community. ["Hear, hear!"] After a close study of the speeches of the Unionist Leaders during his election campaign he assured the agricultural labourers in his constituency that he would support a real Employers' Liability Bill, but what excuse could he make to them, now that they were excluded from the operation of this Measure, when the men in the towns, who often earn ten times their wage have the benefit of this Measure? The lot of agricultural labourers was not a happy one, and there was no wonder that the best of them migrated to the towns. Were not the Government by this Bill adding an inducement to them to continue in that direction? As an argument for the exclusion of agriculture from the Bill, it was said that the accidents from which those engaged in agricultural pursuits suffered were few. Far more accidents occurred in agriculture than people imagined; but even if the accidents were few, the premium paid by farmers to insure against them would certainly be small. He had spoken to many big farmers in regard to this subject, and he did not find them at all hostile to being included in the Bill. He earnestly appealed to the Government to give favourable consideration to the Amendment which would be proposed to include agriculturists in the Bill. If they did bring that class within the scope of the Measure, and so helped to remove the cause of friction that exists between master and man, he was persuaded that the oldest, and by far the greatest and most important, industry in the country would receive a great impetus.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) thought that the Government had every reason to be satisfied with the manner in which their Bill had been received in every part of the House. In his opinion, no more important Bill had been introduced during the last 50 years—["hear, hear!"]—and if he had been told some time ago that a Conservative Government would introduce a Measure of such a character he would have been staggered by the information. There was more socialism pure and simple in the Bill than in any Bill which had been submitted during the last half-century, and many of the arguments used in favour of it could be equally well applied to any Measure brought in to provide food, clothing, and medical attendance for the working classes. He was not averse to accidents being provided for, but there were many ways of making that provision. Those who, like himself, had been associated with a dangerous trade knew that for the last 25 years the workmen had been most anxious to make provision for themselves and their families in case of accidents in their occupation. They saw that exemplified in various ways. In his own county, and in other parts of the country they had Miners' Permanent Relief Funds established, which had been of incalculable benefit to those connected with them, not only for the assistance they received in the shape of financial payments, but for the training they had afforded in self-government, and the inducements they had offered to look into all those financial questions. He thought these men had been qualified to a very great degree by these funds to exercise their citizenship in a way that had been of real advantage to the country. He certainly would not like to see these funds disappear. He was not prepared to say, like some of his hon. Friends who had spoken in this Debate, that this Bill would be the death blow to these funds. He hoped it might not. It was quite possible it might be the death blow so far as the owners' contributions were concerned, but as the Bill did not comprise everything which at the present time was dealt with by these funds, he thought there was still a large sphere open to them to develop and continue the usefulness that they were now carrying on. So far as he was concerned, he could not say that he objected to the principle of this Bill. As he had said, he did not object to compensation for accidents. He expected, however, that when the Government brought in a Bill of this kind the least they would have done would have been to make some sort of provision for accidents caused by the act of God, with which employers as employers had no more to do than any other member of the community. He was surprised that they should make an employer responsible for an accident caused to a man by his own negligence or carelessness. He thought that was going a step beyond what might be reasonably expected. He thought the Bill was in a very crude state, and if he were asked to deal with any particular part of it, he confessed he would have a difficulty in finding a single part of its details with which he perfectly agreed. He was glad to find that the Government preserved an open mind, and were prepared to consider the questions that had arisen in the course of the Debate in a liberal and reasonable way. So far as he was concerned, and he believed so far as hon. Members who represented great artisan and mining constituencies were concerned, the Government would get every assistance in trying to make this Bill a perfect Measure so far as it could be, provided they accepted those Amendments which would be proposed on the sound and right lines. He agreed with the Attorney General when he said that if they increased the cost of accidents to an employer, undoubtedly the employers would use more diligence in preventing risks of accident. He believed that it would lead to greater strictness and more careful supervision on the part of managers, and one effect of this Bill upon employers would be that if they saw any workman negligent or careless, and doing anything which was likely to tend to or promote an accident, they would certainly discharge him in order that it might be a lesson to those who remained. In a most dangerous mine of his own, a short time ago, a box of matches was found, and the next morning all the men were carefully examined, and three of them were found to have pipes and tobacco and matches. They were prosecuted, and he thought it was his duty to prosecute them in order to show that conduct of that kind was not only injurious to themselves, but to those with whom they were associated. Suppose an explosion had taken place in the mine, he scarcely thought it could have been said that it was owing to the negligence of the employer. There was a great difficulty in a mineowner covering himself even by insurance from all the risks under this Bill. There was no insurance company that he was aware of would accept a greater risk for explosion than £5,000. £5,000 was a very small amount when they considered what might happen by an explosion. They had had disasters in this country where 400 men had lost their lives. At £200 per man that would mean £80,000. There were very few owners who could look with any degree of complacency upon a risk of that kind. He confessed he was somewhat amazed at the calm with which some hon. Members, who practically did not suffer to any degree under those risks, discussed this question. He had had careful examinations made into the cost to the coal industry, and he was bound to admit that it was most difficult to estimate what would be the actual effect of this Measure financially. Allusion had been made on the previous night to Mr. Merivale, Professor at the Mining College, Newcastle, who stated that compensation would represent something like two-thirds of a penny per ton. He had had the figures carefully gone over, and to give the House a little illustration of the loose and lax way in which the calculation had been made, he would point out one or two things in connection with it. Mr. Merivale said there were 700,000 persons employed in and about mines. As a matter of fact there were 726,000 persons. He next assumed that there were 170 per thousand cases of partial disablement, with an average duration of four weeks. But Lancashire and Cheshire's experience was 180 per thousand, and the average duration was 4¾ weeks. As to permanent disablement he assumed that there were eight cases per thousand per annum employed, equal to a disablement of not quite two years. Lancashire and Cheshire's experience showed that there were 4½ cases per thousand, but that the disablement period was 3½ years. Then as to the deaths. Professor Merivale assumed there were 1,100 deaths per annum. In Lancashire and Cheshire for the five years ending 1895 there were 1,457 deaths per annum. He had had an opportunity of seeing that day Sir Wm. Lewis, who probably knew as much about the South Wales coal trade as any man in the country, and he assured him that it would cost something like close upon 3d. per ton in South Wales. That, of course, was without taking into consideration the quantity of coals consumed in the collieries, and Professor Merivale had made no allowance whatever on that point. Adopting Mr. Merivale's figures of 13s. per week for disablement and £200 for death, the amount charged to the trade would be:—Partial disablement, £416,475; permanent disablement, £386,464; deaths, £291,400; or a total of £1,094,339, or on the total output of 1896 1·34d. per ton. If the full compensation provided for by the Bill was taken it would represent £1,652,450, or on the total output 2·02d. per ton. He admitted, however, that they could not make an accurate calculation which could be thoroughly relied on to suit the whole of the country. The Attorney General used an extraordinary argument in reply to the late Home Secretary in alluding to the difference between the calculation that they made as to cost and what they actually bore at the present time. He said that under the Bill of the late Home Secretary, if that Bill had been passed, they would have paid almost as much as they would pay under the present Bill. He failed to gather from the Attorney General how he made that out. All that they paid at the present time for insurance against accidents, including explosions up to £5,000, was 1-16th per cent., and he believed that under the Bill of the late Home Secretary it would have been one-fourth per cent. Under the present Bill they would not get their insurance effected for less than probably 1½ or 2 per cent. For the Attorney General to say that to compensate for all accidents, whether employers had anything to do with them or not, would make very little difference to what would have been done by the Bill of the late Home Secretary—which compensated no accidents except such as could be shown to have occurred from the negligence of a fellow-workman—he thought was absurd. The present Bill would in every way put a much heavier burden upon the mining industry than would have been done by the Bill of the late Home Secretary. He was not one of those who believed that even 2½d. or 3d. per ton extra would ruin the coal trade of the country. It would have to be paid by somebody—the consumer, the employer, or the workman—possibly by them all. But in Northumberland and Durham, where a large proportion of the coal was exported, and where they came into direct competition with foreign producers, who were fighting them in every market that they had access to, he was not sure that they would be able to make the consumer pay any of it. Did they think that a considerable portion of this charge would not come from wages? Did they think that the coal owners, when they were treating with their men, would not bring forward the argument that they had got an additional burden of 3d., or 2d., or 1d. to pay? They had always done it, and consequently this Bill would be a serious charge upon wages. With regard to the exclusions of the Bill, he failed to see why the Government had adopted their present method of giving exclusions. He would rather have seen every industry included; but small employers should have the benefit of exemption if exemption were thought to be necessary. He was surprised that shipowners should be exempted. Shipowners paid no poor rates whatever. All the widows that were made in the shipping industry had to be supported by other people. He was of opinion that when Measures of this kind were accepted by the House, everybody should feel the burden of them. ["Hear, hear!"] As to bankruptcies, he quite agreed that many large employers in dangerous trades would have to consider whether it was wise not to limit their liability under the liability law. He defied anyone to calculate what would be the liability of the coal owners under this Bill. He hoped the Government would be disposed in Committee to accept some clause which would enable employers and workmen in case of need to insist upon some guarantee from a reliable and respectable insurance company. He thought there was very little difference in this Bill from the German proposals. In his opinion it was not so liberal to employers. In Germany the sick fund paid for the first 13 weeks all the expense of an accident, and that was a very large protection and a very liberal allowance to the employer, but in this Bill there were only two weeks, and then they were not to be allowed to revise the matter for three months, so that practically a workman would get two weeks' allowance, and then he could not be compelled to go before the doctor till three months were over. He thought a good case would be made out for contributions from the State, and for a contribution from the royalty owners. There were precedents for such a course—namely, when the Poor Law was extended to Ireland in 1835, and in 1877, when lead mines were, for the first time, made chargeable to the Poor rates. These were points, however, which could be discussed in Committee. If, in the course of the Debate, the Government found that so many difficult questions had arisen that they would have to withdraw the Bill this Session, he hoped they would bring it forward in another year. He did not want to escape from the principle of the Bill, because he thought it was a good one; but when they were making this new departure—a new departure with such vast possibilities—he thought it was nothing but right that the country should have an opportunity of considering the whole question on its merits, and that they should have some opportunity of consulting their constituents upon it.

Mr. THOMAS RICHARDSON (Hartlepool), as an employer affected by the Bill, congratulated the Government on having brought in a Measure which promised so effectively to grapple with a complex problem. The Government had also given evidence, by the concessions already made, of their desire to improve the Bill. In his judgment the Bill was, no doubt, a long step in the direction of industrial socialism, though he had no doubt that coal owners and others affected by it would find some way out of the difficulties which confronted them. As a rule, works which were full of machinery were found to be the most dangerous places, but, judging by the discussion, the opinion appeared to be entertained that they were about the safest places a man could be in. He could only account for this impression by the fact that in engineering works 2s. 6d. per cent. of the wages paid would cover the liability under the Bill. He had looked over the number of accidents in his own industry during the past ten years, and had applied the provisions of the Bill to them. This was the result. The total number of accidents during the ten years was 94, five of them, unfortunately, fatal. Out of the remainder 21 men were off work one week and less; three were off three days; 22 men were off two weeks; and 46 had an average loss of nine weeks. Not a single man had been off for a whole year. He believed that in the engineering works the amount to be paid did not reach a halfpenny per man a week, and this was not likely to come out of the wages. He believed that employers of labour were only too willing to pay compensation to the men injured in their works, provided they were sure that the money went in the right direction. What had annoyed employers was the fact that the money should go in aid of litigation. It had been stated that out of every £1 in compensation, on an average 15s. had been contributed to the lawyer. In the industry with which he was connected, they had always been able to steer clear of litigation, and he did not think that under the Bill many employers would be frightened into insuring against the accidents that might occur. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean spoke about the necessity of safeguards. He hoped that when the Bill was in Committee hon. Members would remember that the works which were full of machinery were not the most dangerous places, that they had already suffered in consequence of the interference of inspectors under the Factories Acts. The inspectors stipulated that the employers must put a certain guard on machinery —a provision which put the employer to a great deal of useless expense. In many cases these guards on machinery had led to accidents which in some cases were rather serious. The right hon. Baronet also referred to the question of doctors; but there was no need to be in a hurry about that subject. Any man injured in his own works was immediately removed on an ambulance to the hospital, and was attended there by the hospital doctor; but in the case of trivial accidents the man was treated at home, and, besides, nearly every works had a doctor of their own. If neither of those doctors was available, there was the doctor under the Factory and Workshops Act who visited workshops periodically. As to the Friendly Societies, he assured the House that there was no fear of their being ruined by the Bill in any way. So far from young fellows joining these societies with the idea of making a provision in the case of sickness, the idea was far from their minds; their idea was that they would not come to want, and they joined these societies on the persuasion of their friends. He was quite sure that there was nothing in the Bill that would at all injure, much less ruin, the Friendly Societies. He had great pleasure in giving his support to the Bill, for he agreed that it was one possessing enormous advantages for the working classes of this country. He joined other hon. Members in the hope that it might be possible—if not now, then at some future time—to include other industries within its scope, for he believed that, although, as he had said, the Measure would be of enormous advantage to the working classes, in practice it would be found not to be a serious matter for the employers. ["Hear, hear!"]

On the return of Mr. SPEAKER after the usual interval,

*MR. C. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said he did not think the Government had dealt with the question in a very satisfactory manner. To differentiate in the way they had between different classes of workmen and to create distinct privileges before the law for one class as compared with another seemed rather a retrograde step. The main object for which the working classes had been striving of late years was to secure as far as possible equality of right, opportunity, and treatment before the law, and no one had yet attempted to show that the present Bill brought this about. On all sides there was a general consensus of opinion—and he admitted that this was the boldest step in the direction of collectivism that any Government had yet ventured to take—[*Ministerial cheers*]—that the Government would have to go further than they had already done. Many persons thought that when the present Government came to deal with this question their Bill would apply both to domestic servants and shop assistants. He could conceive no reason either in justice or equity for the exclusion of many industries that were excluded from the operation of the Bill, and particularly the building trade. One of the organs that supported the Government and circulated largely in the north of England, *The Newcastle Chronicle*, had described the Bill as an accident-promoting and wage-decreasing Bill. Whether that were so or not, no one could doubt that German experience tended to show, notwithstanding all that had been said by the Home Secretary and the Colonial Secretary, that since the adoption of universal insurance in Germany, accidents had been on the increase. That might be nothing more than a coincidence, but there the fact stood. According to official documents issued from the Foreign Office, the number of accidents reported during 1895 was 75,527 as against 69,719 in 1894, of which 6,448 were fatal and 1,706 produced an entire incapacity for work. It was not surprising that accidents should increase, because under such arrangements as were proposed in the Bill, compensation would be paid automatically, and there would be no incentive to inquire into the cause of the accident, and such inquiries enabled preventive measures to be taken. There would be no inducement to carefulness on the part of either workman or the employer. He did not think that this Bill would get rid of litigation. He agreed with what the Colonial Secretary said in 1880, that where there was a legal remedy the way was opened to litigation; and under this Bill there was every inducement to the employer to go to litigation in the Arbitration Court. There would be many questions as to whether the injured workman came within the Act, and as to the extent of the compensation. The employer knew that in any case the compensation given could not exceed 50 per cent. of the workman's wages, and the workman would be infinitely worse off than under the Act of 1880, because no compensation would be paid until the Court had given its decision. As to the cost of working the Bill, the estimate of the Home Secretary was much too modest. In 1880 the present Colonial Secretary estimated the cost on the mining industry of the Act of that year at one farthing per ton, and added that the cost would be ten times greater if compensation were given for all accidents. He preferred that estimate of 1880; and an additional burden of 2d. per ton. on the coal trade of Northumberland would, in its present state, spell ruin. Of the coal produced in Northumberland 80 per cent. was sent abroad to compete with foreign coal, and it was not likely, therefore, that the increased cost of production would come out of the consumers' pockets. A large portion of it, at least, would be defrayed out of wages. Experience proved that where industrial legislation increased the cost of production, wages had been reduced. Even if the modest estimate of the cost put forward by the Home Secretary were true, there was reason to fear that wages would be affected. In Committee he should propose an Amendment providing that the coal owners should be entitled to recoup themselves for the increased cost of production involved by the Bill from the rates now charged by royalty-owners. ["Hear, hear!"] At the present time they were bearing a charge in the shape of mining royalties of over five millions per annum; and he thought that as royalty owners were directly interested in the development of their mining royalties they ought to have some share of the increased charge that would be thrown upon the coal industry. It had also been said that the Labour representatives had accepted the principle of the Bill, though it contained a provision for contracting out, although they had rejected the Bill of 1893, because contracting out had been inserted in it in another place. But contracting out was not the main principle of this Bill, and as he had never seen any reason for changing his opinion in regard to contracting out he should certainly put down an Amendment to strike that provision out of the Bill. He looked upon the main principle of the Bill—the principle of giving compensation for all accidents as a sound principle; and he, therefore, would not put the House to the trouble of dividing against the Second Reading. But he was bound to say that he viewed the provisions of the Bill with very mixed feelings indeed, and, in his opinion, having regard to all its details, it was less favourable to the working classes than the Bill of the late Home Secretary.

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) said that as an employer he desired to warmly congratulate the Home Secretary and the Colonial Secretary upon the Bill. He fully recognised that it would lay a serious burden on some industries, especially the coal industry; but as a coal proprietor he approved of the Bill, and accepted his share of the burden, because he believed the tendency of the Bill would be to prevent litigation. ["Hear, hear!"] Employers did not grudge their workmen some provision in cases of accident, but what they objected to was that they should have to pay in legal expenses two or three times as much as the injured workmen received in the way of compensation. He regarded as most important the provision that, in the case of total disablement, payment of the compensation should be made in instalments. If the money were paid in a lump sum it would soon be dissipated; but by being paid in instalments the injured workman was prevented from becoming a charge on the community; and employers would not be exposed to the opprobrium of having men disabled in their service on the parish or going about the streets begging. The late Home Secretary had unfavourably contrasted the Bill with the Bill which he himself had introduced. He should like to submit both Measures to a very simple and plain test. The Report of the Inspector of Mines in his district showed that during last year there had been 39 fatal accidents. Of those two only could have been dealt with under the Bill of the late Home Secretary, while the whole 39 would have been covered by the present Measure. ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman also objected to the Bill because it did not tend to prevent accidents. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to prevent accidents under his own Bill by abolishing the doctrine of common employment. But he failed to see how making the employer responsible for the default of the fellow workmen would make the fellow workmen more careful. On the contrary, a workman would be less inclined to be careful if he felt that any fellow workman injured by his recklessness would be fully compensated. ["Hear, hear!"] He asserted that in the interest of the workman, in the interest of the employer, and in the interest of the community at large this Bill was beyond all question a better Measure than the Bill of the late Home Secretary. It had been said that the Bill was inimical to the friendly societies and trade unions. He believed it would be a great assistance to those bodies in relieving them of much of their burdens, and in leaving them free to deal with questions of sick relief and old-age pensions for their members. The hon. Member for St. Helens said that it was unfair to burden the employer with the consequences of the workman's own act and fault. That was true as a matter of abstract justice, but as an employer he would rather deal with those few cases which might arise under those circumstances than he would have the element of uncertainty introduced where the question of contributory negligence might be made a matter which would lead to litigation. An industry that would not bear the natural burdens that pertained to it was an industry that was not worth carrying on. He had said that he was in favour of this Bill, but he was not prepared to say that it was a perfect Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] There were

Amendments which he hoped would be accepted by the Home Secretary in Committee. He thought the Bill ought to be extended to a large number of trades which were at present excluded. As to the question of malingering, there was no doubt that in many cases half wages without work would be more acceptable than full wages with work; in many trades the men were fully employed at one period of the year and not at another, and it would happen that half wages on the basis of full employment would be more than a man could earn when employment was only partial. In that respect there would be at any rate a great temptation to malinger. He thought that provisions in regard to the men regularly reporting themselves to a doctor in case of illness were absolutely necessary. Such provisions and regulations were found to be necessary in friendly societies, and in workmen's clubs, and a man had to report himself to a doctor, or to the colliery surgeon every week, and get a note before he was entitled to his pay. Then there was a provision that if a man was permanently injured he should be entitled to a certain weekly payment, but that arrangement in the case of the widow of a man who was killed was done away with. He submitted that it was twenty times more important in the case of a poor woman who was left helpless than in the case of the man himself. He hoped the Home Secretary would consider the suggestion that the payments should be made to the widow by instalments. In the case of the man himself, he thought there ought to be a provision by which he could accept a lump sum instead of the instalments, as such a sum might be useful as capital in starting a man in a small business. He concluded by cordially accepting the Bill, which he believed was the most beneficent piece of legislation for the working classes of this country which had been passed—certainly during this century. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. J. W. LOGAN (Leicester, Harborough) said the hon. Member for Derby had declared that this Bill was not satisfactory, because it did not provide for the prevention of accidents, but the hon. Member himself did not adduce one single argument in support of his Amendment. The hon. Member said that this Bill would destroy all thrift among the working classes, and set the trades union leaders to stir up strife among the working classes. He was surprised that the hon. Gentleman should have such a bad opinion of the working men. The hon. Member had also said that this Bill would have the effect of destroying many charities and valuable institutions which existed. All he could say was that if the effect of the Bill would be to prevent the working people from placing reliance on charity, he for one would most heartily welcome it. He wished to see the working classes loathe and despise charity, and there was no more certain way of inculcating thrift than to teach them to do so. He thought it was but bare justice that the man who was maimed should look to the industry in which he was maimed for his maintenance. ["Hear, hear!"] When he heard the hon. Gentleman speaking on behalf of charity he was reminded of what was said by one of the deepest thinkers of this country:—

> "The one ordered sacrifice, is to do justice; and it is the last we are ever inclined to do—anything rather than that. As much charity as you choose, but no justice. Nay, you will say, 'Charity is greater than justice.' Yes, it is greater; it is the summit of justice; it is the temple of which justice is the foundation. But you cannot have the top without the bottom; you cannot build upon charity."

He thought the Government had taken one of the best steps they could to insure greater safety to the working clases by providing that the pecuniary responsibility for accidents should rest upon the shoulders of the employer. He did not think for a moment that the money which would have to be provided would come out of wages, and he believed that in the long run the effect of the Bill would be to improve the producing power of the men of this country. But supposing the money necessary to pay this compensation were to come out of the profits, he would point out that the amount of profit upon which income tax was paid in 1881 was 255 millions, while in 1895 it was no less a sum than 336 millions. Therefore, it could, if necessary, stand an additional charge. The figures relating to industrial profits for 1895 were ample justification for this Bill. Even if the money necessary to be found should come out of the profits of trade, he thought this Measure was justified, and he believed a more liberal or juster arrangement could not be made for the rank and file of workmen. With such a record of the paupers before us in this country as the records showed, they ought cheerfully to welcome such an attempt as the Government were now making to provide for the rank and file of their great industrial army. ["Hear, hear!"] Mr. Bainbridge had suggested that the Bill would put a 2d. burden on the cost of coal. Even if that were so, he would suggest to Mr. Bainbridge that the colliery proprietors should help to make the royalty owner, to whom they paid from 5d. to 6d. a ton, contribute towards the burden imposed by this Bill. It was seldom indeed he had the great pleasure of congratulating right hon. Gentlemen opposite upon any efforts of theirs on behalf of the toilers of this country. He hoped they would believe him when he said that he was absolutely certain that had this Bill been brought in by hon. Members upon the Opposition side, a great many hon. Gentlemen opposite would find themselves compelled to oppose it. [*Laughter.*] He congratulated the Government on having brought in the Bill, because it contained the right principle that the employer should be responsible for the man who met with an injury. He welcomed the Bill because he desired to see employers as concerned for their men as they were for their engines and their horses. And if throughout the Bill had been as sympathetic as it was in the first sub-section, he would have nothing but praise to say of the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped that the Government would accept Amendments which would remedy some of the defects, which were many, of the Bill. The one as to the weekly allowances would need consideration. Then Sub-section (3) of Clause 1 would lead to a vast amount of litigation and work for the lawyers. In his own business as a contractor they sublet a considerable amount of work, and provision should be made that the principal contractor could not shift his responsibility under the Bill to any sub-contractor he might employ. However the Government might deal with these Amendments, he should support the Bill, because of the principle it contained that compensation should be paid to the workman in all cases. He wanted to see that principle placed on the Statute Book. He said so with a full sense of what that led to. When it became recognised that every workman would have to be compensated, the State would have to step in and guarantee that the money was paid to men injured, and the State would be amply justified in doing so, and would be fully compensated for it by remembering that safeguarding the working classes and making them more efficient instruments of production was one of the first things the State should do. He objected to the provision in Sub-section (a), by which a man was fined two weeks' wages because he had been injured. A large percentage of the working classes lived from hand to mouth, he was sorry to say; they had no available balance of wages, and the amount that they received did not admit of their putting by anything. Recognising, as this Bill did, the great principle that the man who was doing his duty should not suffer from having done it, he was surprised that the Bill should in this section propose to plunge a man into difficulties for doing his duty. Supposing a man were injured for six or eight weeks, for the first two weeks he would receive nothing, and, consequently, would run into debt; the next four weeks before he was able to work again he would receive half his wages, which would not be sufficient to enable him to pay all his current expenses, and the consequence was that he would run further into debt, with the result that when he was fit to go to work he would have a weight of debt hanging around his neck which it would take him some time to remove. Therefore he was sorry that the Government had not recognised that the responsibility of the employer should commence before the end of 14 days. In common with many others, he was sorry that the Government had not yet seen their way to extend the Measure, especially to horse drivers, more of whom were killed than engine drivers. But, having made this start, they would not be able to stop, and he had no desire that the Government should stop. ["Hear, hear!"] It was in the interests of the Tory Party, as well as in the interests of the working classes, that they should extend the scope of the Bill. It was not from a party point of view that he urged them to increase their popularity in the country. He could assure them that they would receive from him no captious opposition, because he regarded the principle contained in the first sub-section of the Bill so valuable in the interests of the working classes throughout the country that it should not be lightly thrown aside. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said the Bill was important for the workman; first, in securing his safety—the primary consideration in any Employers' Liability Bill—and, secondly, in securing compensation for him, which was a great boon if it were certain and assured, and not illlusory and misleading, and if these results could be gained without imposing such undue burdens upon an industry as to divert it, by which the workman might suffer, and he hoped whatever was done good relations between employers and workmen would be strengthened, for this was economic, and well worth some obligations being accepted by employers. He remarked that the first point the House had to accept was that this Bill would have some effect in increasing the cost of production. A great deal had been said about the coal industry, but that was only one of a great many industries that would be affected. He knew no more difficult matter than to say where the increased cost would ultimately rest. In the case of a monopoly the consumer could be made to pay, but where there was free competition he defied anyone to say where it would fall—on the business, or profits, or wages, or upon the consumer. He did not hesitate, however, to say that in this case some proportion of it might fall on wages. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore it was for the working classes to consider whether the effect of the Bill would be entirely beneficial. ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill made a most important new departure. For 300 years the basis of liability in business had been negligence in some form or other, though negligence had been held by an excrescence in the law in some cases not to constitute liability—he referred to the doctrine of common employment, which created a manifest injustice in the legal fiction that a manager in a superior position was the colleague of a man who had no control or power at all, which would have no real foundation since the introduction of the factory system. Whatever else was done, the abolition of the doctrine of common employment should have been one of the first steps in the improvement of the law. ["Hear, hear!"] Again, under the Act of 1880 a great injustice had been perpetrated on the working man by the necessity of givng notice of an injury within a specified time, which had led to benevolence for a time and then to repudiation. There was also the question of sub-contracting, and there again there was room for remedy. He ventured to say that the remedying of these points was even more urgent than the granting of compensation—["hear, hear!"]—because they disturbed and rendered most unjust the relations between employer and employed, and so caused injury and loss to both. The Bill passed over negligence as an element of liability—even contributory negligence, he thought, and possibly, according to the working of the Bill, even wilful neglect or default—a concession for which he saw no reason. It substituted for these compensation, and introduced into the law of Employers' Liability two terms unknown before, compensation and insurance. He admitted that the Bill had one advantage. It would do something to decrease litigation. The Act of 1880 had been most unfortunate in that respect, but the cases under it had chiefly arisen on the doctrine of common employment, and on the absence of notice of the injury, and, if these defects had been removed, there would have been a great decrease in litigation. But that was to be changed, and what was the new principle? It was that if in the course of a lawful trade, and without any wrongful act or default in the employer or his agents, machinery was set in motion, the person who did this must assume, without practically much limitation, all the consequences of it. Would all businesses survive this additonal burden? They had not only to deal with to-day. Times were good now, but there might be a return to the condition of things experienced between 1890 and 1895, and therefore it was necessary to consider carefully whether, in the stress of both national and international competition, and in times not so prosperous as now, an additional burden, so variously estimated, could safely be borne by the industries of this country. ["Hear, hear!"] Although large concerns might be able to deal with bad times, smaller businesses felt them much more. The latter might find it difficult to insure, or might have to incur large premiums, and the House must take care not to run undue risk of destroying businesses of that class, which were the backbone of the trade of this country, especially in London. Great effort should be made to prevent the universal creation of limited concerns and Trusts, for if the effect was to kill the smaller businesses it would have a most lamentable effect on the trade of the country, while the experience of America as to Trusts and monopolies was a strong warning. Did the Bill assure compensation to the workman with the certainty that was desired? Was the basis of the Bill wide enough to make it safe and permanent? In other words, was the base of the Bill wide enough to be effective? Because if it were not so it would be illusory. What was to happen in the case of the insolvency of an employer? And were the payments to the insured to be preferential in bankruptcy like wages? The Attorney General suggested that instead of payments by instalments cash should be paid at once. Would not that precipitate a disaster? ["Hear, hear!"] He believed that the only possible solution ultimately would be the security of the State. [*Cheers.*] The inevitable outcome was State assistance, or, like the German system, the security of employers' associations. We must be careful of putting burdens on particular businesses to their prejudice and to the disappointment of the employés, who might find, after relying on them, that their employers could not fulfil their expectations. That would be a disaster to the social relations of this country. He hoped the Government would seriously consider whether the limitation of trades was a practical one, and whether for the safety and success of this Bill it would not be necessary to strengthen the base on which the Bill was built, and by putting both burden and benefit on all classes, make all responsible for the practical wisdom and economical success of the Measure. A few words as to details. The Bill was limited to four industries. Why was it so limited? He thought that was a mistake. If injuries were sustained in employments why should there not be equal compensation? ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill as it stood might produce what was the worst of any of the features in the relations of employers and employed—inequality. The Bill created anomalies, and he hoped the Government would very much enlarge its scope. If that was not done by this Government it would be done by the next House of Commons. He complained of the 6th Sub-section of Clause 3, which, he contended, was a derogation from the existing common law right of the workmen in the use of the word "wilful." These, however, were points which could be dealt with in Committee. He thought there were strong objections to the Measure as it stood, but on the other hand, it was a Bill which boldly dealt with a new principle in the development of economic and social views. As a new departure they would all gladly vote for its Second Reading as a tentative experiment.

Mr. THOMAS ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton) expressed his satisfaction that this new social departure had been accepted so quietly on the other side of the House. For himself, he thought the two great objections to the Bill were—first, that sufficient care was not taken in it for the further prevention of accidents; and, second, the limited scope of the Bill. Looking at the paternity of the Bill, he was a little disappointed that it was not in these respects of a different character. The Colonial Secretary objected greatly to the last Employers' Liability Bill because it did nothing to further prevent accidents, and it was limited in its scope. The right hon. Gentleman desired to see the scope of that Measure so enlarged that it would take in even domestic servants. Where were the right hon. Gentleman's servant girls to-day. [*A laugh.*] He regretted to say that they had been basely deceived and deserted by the Colonial Secretary. [*Laughter.*] It was certainly quite possible to take further means to prevent accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] Reference had been made to the German insurance system. He knew that very many hon. Members objected to anything that came from Germany. Sometimes German goods were superior to English goods, and he, personally, was not prepared to refuse to take a lesson from Germany if the goods she produced were of good quality. Taken as a whole, he regarded the German insurance system as a good system. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife described what he considered were the central and best features of that system, but in his opinion the right hon. Gentleman entirely overlooked what really was the system's best feature. The right hon. Gentleman told them that employers were grouped, and that they had to pay for all accidents. The House were led to suppose, either by the right hon. Gentleman or others, that in Germany there was a State direct insurance. Nothing was further from the fact. The main and best feature of the German system was that the funds were collected and managed by the employers. The employers, therefore, had every inducement to see that each member of their body conducted his business in the most careful manner possible. His firm had never insured, with the result that they had been very careful to take all precautions; but he felt that, with the added risks under this Bill, it would be necessary for them to insure, and if they did they would, he was sure, prefer to be grouped with fellow employers for purposes of insurance than to go to outside insurance companies. As the hon. Member for Gainsborough had pointed out, there might be a tendency on the part of employers to prefer to employ young and unmarried men to old and married men; but another serious objection to the Bill, in his opinion, was the great risk there was that employers would not be able to pay the compensation. He was glad that in all quarters of the House the opinion prevailed that the trade ought to bear the risk. If the trade was to bear the risk the employer was the only person to look to for the payment of the compensation. So far as collieries were concerned he sympathised with hon. Members who thought that part of the risk ought to come out of the pockets of the royalty owners. Royalties were rent in one form, and rent, economically speaking, was that which was left after labour and capital had received a fair return. If part of the workmen's compensation was going to be taken out of the proceeds of capital, part also ought to come out of the royalty as rent. Under the German system, instead of each employer being liable, instead of the workman having to take the risk of the employer's failure, there would be a growing fund contributed to by all the employers, out of which the workman would be certain to get his compensation. But if they could not have that, he hoped that the Government would, at any rate, consent to a plan under which lump sums would be paid instead of pensions for life. That would secure the injured workman against the risk of the subsequent failure of the employer. Coming to the question of contracting out, he admitted that the working man who came within the purview of this Bill would in most respects be free from the dangers of contracting out. At the same time, there would be a very large number of workmen who would still be subject to them. He believed that if they could have the German system, there would not be the same objection on the part of the supporters of this Bill to the inclusion within its scope of a very large number of the trades at present excluded. What was the main objection of the Government against the inclusion of a large number of trades? That which weighed with them was the plight of the poor employer who might not be able to stand the racket of the accidents. The Home Secretary had told them that he had selected certain trades because they were rich trades. So the Government were going to give this compensation to workmen who were employed by rich men, who would most likely give it in any circumstances, while the workmen under poor employers were to be deprived of it. He could not see any justification for this. It seemed to be assumed by some hon. Members that all the employers who would be affected by this Bill were wealthy people, but that was an error. There were a large number of farmers who could just as well afford to compensate their labourers as some of the employers who would come within the scope of the Bill. He did not mean by this that in his opinion the farming industry was prosperous, but he asserted that there were also a great many employers in the trades within the Bill who were not prosperous. In the town of Burnley, for example, the trade of cotton weaving was largely carried on by very small employers. There were weaving sheds with a thousand looms in them, but these looms were distributed very often among different employers, who ran some 200 looms apiece. The cotton was found for them by the cotton broker, and the position of these employers was very little indeed above that of working men. Their capital was very small. These considerations pointed to the desirability of establishing a general insurance system such as existed in Germany, under which all employers paid their little quota to the insurance fund. It had been pointed out that the risks in the agricultural industry were very small, and that was true, but, if that industry were brought within the Bill, the premiums payable by the farmer would also be correspondingly small, and the same was true of the householder. A man who met with an accident while working at one of the excluded trades deserved compensation just as much as a man working at a trade within the purview of the Bill. He held that in whatever trade an accident occurred the Bill ought to provide for compensation by that trade. The way in which the Bill in its present form would work would be most inequitable. Take the following instance. If a man was employed in a cotton factory, and a bale of cotton fell upon him and injured him, he would get compensation. In the next street, a man employed by a flour dealer might be injured in precisely the same way by a falling sack of flour, but he would get no compensation. He could only hope the day was not far distant when the Bill would be extended for the benefit of all workers, irrespective of whether they were employed by wealthy firms or by poor firms.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Whenever I have to make a speech in this House or in the country—an operation for which I have a profound distaste—[*laughter*]—I only have one ambition, and that is to express, in the fewest possible words and with the utmost clearness, the views which I hold upon the subject on which I have to speak. ["Hear, hear!"] If I am to test my oratory by what has just fallen from the hon. Gentleman opposite, I am afraid I should have to confess that four years ago, when I spoke in this House on the Employers' Liability Bill, I must have egregiously failed. I should be altogether discouraged if it were not for the fact that, unless I am mistaken, the hon. Gentleman opposite tried and failed to be a Member of this House on that occasion—[*laughter*]—and consequently did not hear the speech which he has now criticised, and I am afraid he can hardly have read it since. He accuses me of a two-fold inconsistency. He says that on that occasion I laid great stress on the necessity for legislation for the prevention of accidents, whereas in this Bill nothing is done with that object; and he says, secondly, that, whereas on the previous occasion I advocated the claims of domestic servants, he now alleges, with a grace peculiarly his own, that I have basely deceived my servant girls. [*Laughter.*] The answer is very simple. My right hon. Friend the ex-Home Secretary introduced the Bill on which I then spoke as a Bill intended to prevent accidents, and I criticised it—I am not going into old discussions, which I think are now out of date—at that time severely on the ground that, in my opinion, it was not calculated to prevent accidents. I pointed out that, in my opinion, that was not the way to prevent accidents, and that, if you want to prevent accidents, if there was anything still to be done in the direction of preventing accidents, that result was to be sought either by increasing the stringency of your criminal legislation or by additional regulations for the protection of persons employed in industry. As regards domestic servants, it is perfectly true that I advocated their inclusion in that Bill, but that Bill, by admission, was a very much more limited Bill than the present one. I do not think there would have been the slightest objection—and, as a matter of fact, that was the general opinion of the House at that time—to do away with the doctrine of common employment, so far as domestic servants were concerned, but it would raise altogether a different question, which now I am not going to argue, if it were proposed to give domestic servants all the privileges which we propose to give the trades included in this Bill. Having dealt with what was personally addressed to myself, I will now trouble the House with a few remarks upon the general position in which we find ourselves. I rise now, because it seems to me that probably it would be the general wish of the House to come to an early decision.

[*Cheers.*] I think we have discussed the question very fully—I do not say in any sense too fully—and I believe there is a great desire that the important subject which is put down for Debate to-morrow should be taken, and that the consideration of this Bill should not therefore be unduly protracted. ["Hear, hear!"] There is another reason for reaching an early decision. It is this, that while I believe the discussion which we have had is useful, suggestive, and interesting, it must be admitted that it has been very unusual in its character upon the Second Reading of a great Bill, because I venture to say that, with the exception perhaps of a sentence or two in the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Derby, who moved an Amendment to the Bill, there has not been one single word from either side of the House directed to the principle of the Bill. [*Cheers.*] We have been prematurely discussing Committee details during the whole of the two days over which this Debate has lasted. I agree with the statement which was made by the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Cheshire, that the Government ought to be extremely satisfied with the general tone of the discussion. I do not agree with him when he said that our satisfaction would be to some extent lessened by the consideration of the criticism which we have received from our own friends behind us. I think the hon. Gentleman probably took his view from the headlines of a most influential party organ which has given a very great support to this Bill, but which, I observe to-day, in its account of our proceedings yesterday, described them as "Tory attacks upon the Bill: Liberal defences." [*Laughter.*] Of course, we are very glad of defence from whatever quarter it comes, but a more absolutely erroneous description—[*cheers*]—of the character of this Debate could not possibly be devised. The attacks upon this Bill, such as they are—the most serious attacks have come from the other side. They have come from the Member for Gainsborough; they have come from the Member for Durham, and suggestions have been made of a most insidious character, with a view to destroy the Bill, by the Member for Leicester, the Member for Glasgow, and from the Member for one of the Divisions of Cheshire to whom I referred just now. On the other hand, the Bill has been supported again and again by hon. Members on this side. In a speech to which I must pay, if I may be allowed to do so, a respectful compliment, my hon. Friend for one of the divisions of Sheffield gave, on the First Reading of the Bill, the most admirable, and at the same time the most succinct, defence of the Bill which I have heard in the whole course of these proceedings. ["Hear, hear!"] We have also had speeches from my hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester, my hon. Friend the Member for one of the Wiltshire divisions, and by my hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton, and from other hon. Members who have answered the objections which came from the Liberal side of the House. I do not think that the opposition to this Bill has come from employers on this side of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] On the contrary, I, at all events, am bound to recognise the spirit in which they have met the Government proposals, because we admit that we are now putting upon employers a new burden ["Hear, hear!"] I think some of my hon. Friends have exaggerated the amount of the liability which will now be imposed upon them, but we admit that we have put a new burden upon them without suggesting even that there is any moral liability in their case. [*Cheers.*] Notwithstanding that, employer after employer on this side of the House has got up to support the principle of the Bill and to express his readiness to submit to these sacrifices if he can be assured that the Bill will be effectual for its purpose, and will secure to those who may be injured in the course of their employment the compensation which humanity would willingly accord them. [*Cheers.*] There are two lines of criticism on this Bill which, as I say, have been chiefly developed in speeches from the other side of the House. It has been said that the provisions of the Bill would press very heavily on trade and industry and would seriously interfere with trade in certain particular industries named. ["Hear, hear!"] At the same time, it is argued that the Bill must be extended to other trades. Surely there is either inconsistency in that claim or great selfishness. [*Cheers.*] There is great selfishness—if hon. Members who hold this view really believe that their trade is to be ruined, as they have practically represented to us, by the impositions in this Bill—in suggesting that other trades should be ruined as well. On the contrary, they should be glad that some trades, at any rate, should be left in the United Kingdom even after this Bill has been passed into law. [*Laughter.*] These criticisms come from the same people. The people who want to extend the Bill are the people who say that their own trades will be ruined or seriously affected by it. [*Opposition* "No, no!" *and cheers.*]

MR. HUDSON KEARLEY (Devonport): Who says that trade will be ruined on this side of the House?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member for Gainsborough.

*MR. BAINBRIDGE: No, I beg pardon.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member will allow me, I will finish my sentence. The hon. Member stated, unless my recollection deceives me, that the cost of this Bill would be over two pence a ton on coal, and the result would be that many coal mines would be closed. [*Cheers.*] I suppose that when a coal mine is closed the mine-owner may consider, at all events, that that trade has been ruined.

*MR. BAINBRIDGE: I said that a great many mines would be closed, not that the whole of the collieries would be ruined.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: What is the object of making this statement? It is true that the hon. Member and the hon. Baronet the Member for Durham are engaged in the same industry; and the hon. Baronet began by saying that he thoroughly approved the principle of the Bill. [*Cheers.*] If I believed that this Bill was going to ruin any considerable proportion of the coalowners of the country, I would have the courage to say that I did not approve it. [*Cheers.*] The hon. Baronet and the hon. Member for Gainsborough and other hon. Members who have spoken from that side of the House "are willing to wound yet afraid to strike." [*Opposition cries of* "Oh, oh!" *Ministerial laughter, and cheers.*]

SIR J. JOICEY: It is not the principle; it is the methods we object to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not make it universal? [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The question is whether it will ruin the mining industry of this country. If it will, then no one should vote for it; and I ask why do not hon. Gentlemen vote against the Second Reading?

SIR J. JOICEY: I do protest against the right hon. Gentleman continuing to misrepresent the speeches of hon. Members on this side of the House, when he has been told again and again that he is doing this. [*Cheers.*] I must ask him to accept the statement that I do not believe it will ruin the coal trade, and that I approve of the principle of the Bill as thoroughly as he does, but I object to its methods. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I am quoting the hon. Member for Gainsborough. The hon. Baronet the Member for Durham stated that he approved the principle of the Bill—that, I think, was the first sentence in his speech—and he went on to say that he thought he objected to every single provision in it. [*Cheers.*] I do not want to misrepresent hon. Gentlemen when I say that they are "willing to wound yet afraid to strike." [*Ministerial cheers and Opposition* "No, no!"] What is the conclusion of the hon. Baronet's speech? I have come to a suggestion made by the hon. Member for Leicester and other hon. Members; and they all agree in this—that they hope the Government will give ample time, that they thought it would probably be desirable, although the Government might proceed with this Bill, to give ample time for discussion—that is to say, to waste a certain amount of time this Session—and that the Government should withdraw it. [*Cheers.*] These hon. Members will probably go down to their constituents and tell them that they are in favour of the Bill while suggesting to the Government that they ought to withdraw it.

MR. HENRY BROADHURST (Leicester): I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman does not wish to wilfully misrepresent anything I said. I never suggested that the Government should withdraw the Bill. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh, oh!" *and ironical laughter.*] What I said was that I was so much in favour of this Bill that rather than see it go through imperfectly—[*ironical laughter and cheers*]—I would suggest to the Government that they would suffer no disadvantage if they took a longer time to make their Bill a perfect one and an inclusive one, instead of an imperfect Measure. [*Ironical cheers.*]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I must ask the House to consider whether I misrepresent the hon. Member? At all events, I will give the answer of the Government. We have brought in this Bill. We attach the utmost importance to the principle of it; we believe that the country has approved it—[*cheers*]—and we intend at all hazards to take the decision of the House of Commons upon it. [*Cheers.*] We are not going to accept the suggestion either of the hon. Member for Leicester or of the hon. Baronet the Member for Durham to withdraw this Bill—[*ironical Opposition cheers*]—when probably in the next Session something else may cause it to be indefinitely and permanently postponed. [*Cheers.*] After all, hon. Members opposite seem to think that I have done them an injustice. I am very sorry, but they will have the opportunity of showing hereafter where I am wrong. We will watch with the greatest and most friendly interest their proceedings in the subsequent stages of the Bill. [*Cheers.*] There are two ways of killing a Bill. You may kill it by cruelty; I am sure that they would not do that. [*Laughter.*] You may kill it by kindness, you may smother it with Amendments; and it seems to me as if from erroneous notions of what the House of Commons is capable, or from ulterior motives, which I do not impute, they are inclined to overlay this Bill and do their best, at any rate, to endanger it by the Amendments they have suggested.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your own side?

MR. BROADHURST: Most unjust.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I want to warn the House and the friends of the Bill on both sides, because, although I have thought it necessary to indicate that this is the position of many hon. Members opposite, I must frankly admit that there are many hon. Members, including my right hon. Friend the Member for East Fife, who have dealt with this Bill in the most frank and the most cordial manner. I may refer also to the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean and other hon. Members who, I believe, are as friendly to the Bill as the Government themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] But let us on both sides of the House, then, watch the future proceedings on the Bill; and to all those who are friendly to the Bill I do desire to give a warning. It is admitted an all sides that we have had the courage of our opinions, that we have introduced a new principle into English legislation. ["Hear, hear!"] I think we may claim that it was a bold thing to do. [*Cheers.*] And in introducing this new legislation we have openly avowed our opinion that we could not possibly carry it too far. Sir, we believe in this experiment. [*Cheers.*] We believe that it will in practice be found to be even better perhaps than many of our friends now suppose; and possibly, when it can be done with safety and with general assent, it may hereafter be extended. ["Hear, hear!"] But if we had in the first instance brought in this new principle and applied it without exception to all the varied trades and industries in this country, we should have roused so much opposition—["hear, hear!"]—that it would have been absolutely impossible to carry the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Very well; we are serious in our desire that this new principle should have a fair trial, and we will not be led, therefore, by fancied analogies, by talk about logical consistency, to overlay our Bill with a number of separate proposals, all of which will have a tendency to increase the opposition to and thereby prevent the passage of this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] If it is suggested to us that there are cases which are exactly on all fours with the cases included within the Bill, of course those are matters to which we should be very glad to give our attention when we get into Committee, and if we find that without any injustice or without raising any great controversy we can add to the trades already included in the Bill, we shall be very happy to do so. But beyond that we do not propose to go. We propose to follow the course that has always been followed by every prudent Government in dealing with a similar subject. What is the history, for instance, of our factory legislation? ["Hear, hear!"] It is perfectly true, as my right hon. Friend said to-day, that the original proposal of the factory legislation and subsequent proposals were all, one by one, met with great hostility, and that they created great fears in the minds of the industrial classes, and that all that hostility and all those fears have been found to have been unnecessary. ["Hear, hear!"] But if, in the first instance, Lord Shaftesbury and his friends had proposed legislation dealing with every factory and every workshop in the country, does anybody suppose that that Bill could have been passed? Certainly not. It was proposed, in the first instance, to deal with the textile trade; it was proposed later on to add the engineering trade; other trades were added later on, and workshops also. The whole subject has been since reviewed in the light of experience, and a great extension of the principle has been by universal consent agreed to. Well, Sir, I sincerely hope that we may have as good fortune. All we claim to be is to be pioneers. We propose to establish the principle. If the principle fails in practice, of course no one will ever propose to extend it. If it has the success we believe it will have, then we shall consider the exclusions about which so much has been said. Now, Sir, just let us consider—and I do ask the House at this stage to consider, because it may save us time in Committee—what has been proposed in the course of this Debate. It has been proposed that we should add to this Bill—which is already, as I have said, a gigantic Bill—a new proposal of the utmost importance. It must be recognised, for it cannot be denied, that nothing has been more striking than the way in which the Bill has been received in the country. We know of hon. Members who declared beforehand their personal opinion against the Bill, who have, nevertheless, in this House, expressed their determination to support its principle. ["Hear, hear!"] I am not complaining of them in the least, but it is perfectly evident that this change of opinion has been brought about by communications with their constituents; and I do not hesitate to say that this principle is so popular that there will be the greatest indignation in the country if anything occurs to prevent effect being given to it in the present Session. [*Cheers.*] We are asked to add to this Bill the abolition of common employment. They wish us to bring in I do not know how many other trades, including the domestic servants, to whom one hon. Gentleman referred, the agricultural labourers, and the shipping trade, which has always been difficult and exceptional in its character. [*Interruption from the Opposition Benches and Ministerial cries of* "Order!"] What? I say that everybody who has the slightest information about it knows that the shipping trade is admitted to be exceptional. That is one proposal. Just consider it. Suppose the Government agree—I am not saying whether it is right or wrong—but suppose the Government agreed that it was right, and suppose thereupon they accept the Amendment and apply the abolition of the doctrine of common employment to all these other trades, when would the Session end under these circumstances if that great principle and its application to this number of important trades are to be discussed at length in the course of Committee and on the Report stage? ["Hear, hear!"] Then, in addition to that, we are to include in the general scope of the Bill a number of other trades, all of which have had their advocates in the course of the present Debate. We are to add provisions dealing with unhealthy trades. It is said that we might take a clause which was not introduced originally by my right hon. Friend in his Bill, but which was subsequently accepted my him in the course of the Committee Debates upstairs. Let me say one word about that. There is not a word of objection to be taken to the principle of that clause, which proposes to give damages against an employer for any injury to health suffered by a workman in consequence of the neglect of proper precautions by an employer in trade. But, Sir, the matter was not discussed in the Committee upstairs for this reason—that, owing to circumstances with which the House is familiar, the Opposition—the regular Opposition—was not represented on that occasion. And in the discussion on the Report stage the whole attention was concentrated on a particular question—viz., the question of contracting out, and accordingly the other provisions of the Bill received no sufficient investigation. I say, therefore, that that proposal, in a new House, under new circumstances, would deserve and would undoubtedly receive a great deal of discussion. I doubt myself whether the clause would be effective. I think it would lead to an immense amount of litigation. I think it would be almost absolutely impossible to establish a substantial claim for damages under it, because you would have to prove, in the first instance, that the illness of the workman was caused by the trade, and nothing else but the trade; that it was not caused by constitutional weakness on the part of the workman; and that it was directly due to the conditions of the trade; and then you would have to prove that proper precautions had not been taken, and you would have further to prove that the employer was responsible for their not being taken. Well, Sir, anyone who has any experience of litigation under the Employers' Liability Bill would know that it would be extremely difficult, at all events, for a poor workman to make good his complaint under a clause of that kind, and if we were to discuss it anew—I began by saying that I did not in the least object to the principle of the clause—but certainly, if we were to discuss it anew, it is one of those matters which would take a considerable amount of time. ["Hear, hear!"] Then another right hon. Gentleman proposes that we should consider the subject of State insurance. State insurance! It is a gigantic question. And supposing for a moment that we thought it right, raising as it would do, the opposition of the powerful vested interests already engaged in the work of private insurance—supposing we thought it right to do it, I undertake to say that if we made any proposal for State insurance, it would take three or four times as long as the whole of the present Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Then another Gentleman proposes that we should go into the deep and difficult subject of the proper incidence of the taxation which is to be levied in order to support the compensation which is to be given under the Bill. These are admirable proposals, but they are not practicable, and what I particularly call attention to is that they are brought forward by hon. Gentlemen who represent trades which profess to be in great danger of extinction under this Bill. Therefore I think I am justified in saying that not only would the result of passing these amendments be—I will not say fatal—but dangerous to the progress of the Bill, but I think I am justified in saying that that conclusion is not altogether absent from the minds of those who suggested them. It is said that our exclusion of certain trades is illogical. Of course it is; I grant that. But let it be borne in mind who are the people who are now calling for universal dealing with this great subject. Why, they are the people who proposed to deal with but 10 per cent. of the accidents. ["Hear, hear!"] What did they do when they had the opportunity of dealing with this subject? I daresay they may have felt it was very desirable to deal with the whole subject, but they very wisely, when they were the Government, proposed to deal with such portion of the subject as they thought they could deal with successfully, and in their case it was 10 per cent. of the accidents. Now that we propose to deal with 80 per cent. of the accidents they say, "You are leaving out 20 per cent. What an illogical proceeding!" [*Laughter.*] Of course you cannot draw an arbitrary line in legislation and at the same time profess to be absolutely logical. I perfectly agree with the right hon. Member for East Fife when he says it is no satisfaction to a man whose leg is broken by an accident in agricultural employment to be told that a man whose leg is broken in an engineering shop gets compensation. That is perfectly true; but you cannot observe this logical consistency in legislation. You do not observe it in any legislation. Look at your franchise legislation. Is that logical? ["Hear, hear!"] You say that when a man reaches the age of 21 he is to have a vote. Why is he to have a vote when he is 21 and not when he is 20 years and 364 days old? What is the difference in a man the day before he becomes 21 and the day afterwards? It is not logical, but it is admitted to be expedient. Look, again, at the question of taxation. Take, for instance, the income tax. You have limitations below which the income tax does not go. Is there anything logical in that? You say that a man with an income of only £160 a year shall pay no income tax, but that the man with £161 shall have his income taxed. There is no logic in that, but again I say it is expedient, and in the present instance to all those who really care for this Bill and for the establishment of the principle, I urge upon them that it is expedient in the interest of the Measure that it should be confined, at all events, within reasonable limits. [*Cheers.*] We are not concluding the question, we are not determining the principle. We admit that a case may be made for the trades which remain outside the Bill, but we say that this is not the year, this is not the time, in which their particular case can possibly or conveniently be dealt with. The hon. Member for one of the divisions of Wiltshire made a most eloquent plea on behalf of the agricultural labourers, but I think he was hardly just to our modern legislation, because he said the agricultural labourers had always been left out and nothing had been done for them. I will ask the House to consider what was done by the last Conservative Government for the agricultural labourer, and to observe that exactly the same thing happened—that is to say, the principle was arbitrarily restrained in its application. The last Conservative Government brought in legislation for enabling the agricultural labourers to become the owners of their small holdings and to become lessees of allotments, and gave them State aid for that purpose. But nothing again is done for the inhabitants of the towns. ["Hear, hear!"] Logically you cannot defend that. You cannot logically say that a workman in the town is not as much entitled to have assistance from the State in order to purchase his house as the labourer in the country is entitled to have assistance from the State to purchase his holding. I hope the case of the labourers in the towns will hereafter be taken. ["Hear, hear!"] But, at all events, no one has any right to complain that we are varying what has been the universal practice—namely, to deal with one thing at a time, and with one class, if that is the only practical way of dealing with it. I have said there may be cases in which we might probably include a little more than has been included in the Bill. I do not pretend there may not be brought to our notice cases which may have been accidentally omitted. We took as an arbitrary, but very convenient, definition the definition of the Factory Act as given in the Bill; and it will be remembered that, in regard to the building trade, the Factory Act does include in factory legislation buildings where no machinery is used, for some purposes, if they are above 30 ft. in height. It was the intention of the Government, and I am afraid that by some slip that intention is not carried out, to observe absolutely that definition, and we thought the House would be willing to accept the definition which had already appeared in our legislation in regard to the Factory Act. If, therefore, we have failed to include building operations where the buildings are over 30ft. in height, we certainly make no objection to including those buildings; and I have no doubt that that will bring in a very large additional number of labourers engaged in that trade. [*Cheers.*] I will just refer as briefly as I can to certain objections taken from two standpoints from which this Bill has been discussed.

In the first place, I will take those objections which have come rather from the representatives, I will say, of the employers' interests. Objection has been taken to the clause in which we propose that where an employer has been guilty of a wilful or wrongful act or default, the injured workman should have his remedy at his choice, either under the Bill or under the common law or any other statutory law. It is said those words are unusual. They are the best words that our advisers can suggest in order to convey what, perhaps, may be a new idea. We want to distinguish between what I will call moral negligence and technical negligence. I will give an illustration. An employer is technically liable and technically negligent when somebody in his employment in a position of responsibility, say a foreman, acts in such a way as to bring about an accident to a workman. But he is not morally negligent—["hear, hear!"]—in the vast majority of cases it might be contended that he knows nothing whatever about it, and has had no opportunity of preventing it. That I call technical negligence. For that you may make a man pecuniarily liable, but you do not attempt to impose upon him any moral reprobation. On the other hand, if there be a case in which an employer knowingly has neglected a precaution, after being warned, by which life might have been saved, and loss of life and limb has occurred in consequence, that man is morally responsible. He is criminally responsible; he may be—in some cases he is—guilty of manslaughter. We say in those cases we want to reserve to the workman every right which he has at present, or which any future law may give him, and therefore we have put in the Bill that in these cases of moral negligence the workman shall have his choice. That, at all events, is the intention of the Bill, and I believe we have carried it out. But, then, it is said, Why have you not done the same thing in regard to the workman, because the workman also may be guilty of an act, a wilful or wrongful act, for which he ought to be held responsible? I will make a frank statement of the ideas of the Government with reference to that question. I entirely agree as to the morality of the view. I have no doubt the workman ought to be placed upon exactly the same footing as the employer as a matter of right, but as a matter of expediency it appeared to us that, as one of our first objects was to avoid litigation, it was hardly worth while to provide against what, after all, is a very rare case, for the workman is not likely to be guilty of a wilful act or default by which he himself would suffer, and that to introduce such a provision might be to raise as a litigable matter the whole question of contributory negligence. That, however, is a matter for further discussion in Committee, but I hope the House will agree with the Government, and say that as to putting the workman in the game is not worth the candle. Another objection is that we have left a possibly unlimited claim for compensation for what is called permanent incapacity. For instance, to take an extreme case, a man at 25 is permanently injured. He may have, therefore, a claim upon the employer from 25, say, to 70, and that is an enormous liability. That is true. We have proceeded upon the doctrine of averages. What we find is, after inquiry from very large firms and very various employers, that the average of permanent incapacity is only something between three and six years, and we have thought that, as an average to be taken into account in an insurance policy, it would make very little difference. If you suppose, on the contrary, that employers will take this burden on themselves without spreading it over a general insurance, then, no doubt, there might be a case of great hardship, and if it is necessary to provide against such an exceptional case by an exceptional provision it is a point which the Government will be quite open to consider. But by far

Mr. J. Chamberlain.

the most important objection taken on behalf of employers has been the objection that this new liability will be a heavy burden on industry. Now, it is admitted that the coal trade is the trade which will have to bear the heaviest burden, but all our calculations differ materially from those put before the House. I have been furnished by the Lancashire and Cheshire Mines Permanent Relief Fund with their particulars, and certainly I am unable from their statements to come to the conclusion that the cost would be anything like what was stated by the hon. Member for Durham and the hon. Member for Gainsborough. I have here the particulars of the whole of the accidents for which they have made themselves responsible, and the compensation which they have paid. I calculate that the cost under our Bill would be 20s. 9d. per £100 of wages. From statements made in the House I doubt very much whether hon. Members who have made other calculations have taken into account the fact that for the first two weeks there is no payment under our Bill; and although those accidents are minor accidents with which we do not think it necessary that the State should deal, yet, as they are very numerous, the compensation for them amounts to a considerable sum.

SIR J. JOICEY: In his calculation has the right hon. Gentleman taken the wages of the underground men separately? Because by far the larger proportion of accidents take place among them, and they receive the largest part of the wages.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have taken the figures as given to me—the total number of men and the total amount of wages. These are the returns of an association of coalowners, and we must take the calculation over the whole of the employment and the whole of the wages. ["Hear, hear!"] If you took a dangerous employment like the railway shunters' alone, the charge would be enormous; but in reckoning the charge on railway companies I have taken the whole of the employment, and that is the only fair way. [*Cheers.*] I have calculated that the cost will be 1 per cent., roughly. But suppose it is 2 per cent. It is said that this may be fatal to certain mine owners, and to mines which are unfavourably situated. Surely that is a mistake, and hon. Gentlemen exaggerate the effect of a charge of 2 per cent. on wages. They are mistaken in supposing that this charge could not be got out of the cost of the article. This addition of 2 per cent. is nothing compared with the ordinary fluctuations of the trade. In the last three years the average wages in this very industry, for this very association, have gone from 23s. to 26s.—a rise of 15 per cent. [*Cheers.*] On that one item, wages, there has been a fluctuation in three years of 15 per cent., and yet they say that a fluctuation of 2 per cent. would make trade impossible. I am convinced that when this charge is put, not merely on one owner, but on all owners, and is, in effect, mainly a charge upon a particular industry, that the conditions of the trade will very soon adjust themselves to the new liabilities, and that these undertakings will not find themselves in the desperate condition which they now fear. One or two objections were taken from the workmen's point of view. Some hon. Members, but not, I believe, the representatives of the working classes, have said that they fear the effect of this arrangement upon the friendly societies. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that this proposal will give an immense impetus to friendly societies. [*Cheers.*] It will throw upon them the burden of their due work. It will leave open to them the dealing with those trumpery accidents which ought properly to be provided for by the thrift of the workmen themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] I call them trumpery accidents because they do not detain the workman long from his work. It will leave open all that is connected with the health and superannuation of the workman, and I am convinced that, when the burden is taken off the workman of providing for accidents which occur in the course of his employment, he will have the money, and he will spend it in making provision in other directions through the friendly societies. [*Cheers.*] We have been told that while we have provided for incapacity we have not defined incapacity. There seems to be doubt in some minds as to what is meant by total and partial incapacity, by permanent and temporary incapacity. Well, we will not attempt to tariff incapacity—so much for an eye, so much for a leg, so much for an arm, and so much for a hand. There is something very disagreeable in any such attempt—[" hear, hear! "]—and something calculated to raise what may be called sentimental objections, but what are really serious objections. The attempt is also open to such practical objections as that you never can tariff all the accidents which may possibly occur. But what we propose is that the moment a man is injured—whether the accident ultimately develops into total or partial, permanent or temporary, incapacity—and is prevented from pursuing his ordinary employment he has a right to compensation. [An HON. MEMBER: " After two weeks! "] Certainly, after two weeks. Then the amount of compensation is not fixed by the Bill, but a maximum of half the wages is fixed. If the incapacity is total I think the employer will offer him full compensation, or the arbitrator will give it to him. But this case is put—a man may be partially incapacitated; he may still be able to perform other work at a little less remuneration, such a case, for instance, as that of a man who has been earning 30s. a week, and who after an accident gets only 25s. Such a man is entitled to compensation, but undoubtedly the amount of the compensation should be limited to the extent of the incapacity. [" Hear, hear! "] That is to say, the amount of pecuniary compensation he would get would be proportionate to the amount of pecuniary loss he would sustain by the accident. ["Hear, hear! "] Another objection taken, and it is rather an important one, is that although we have provided for compensation, we have not provided against the possibility of the bankruptcy of the person who is to pay the compensation. But my right hon. Friend opposite did not propose to provide against bankruptcy. He was quite right. It is altogether outside the scope of the Bill. Of course, it would be most advisable, if the thing were possible, that we should pass an Act providing that every debtor should pay his debts. [" Hear, hear! " *and laughter.*] But do not let it be supposed that the grievance is greater in the case of an injured workman than it is in the case of any one else. I have known the most pathetic cases of people who tried to save up money for their old age, and by the failure of a friendly society or a bank lost everything. [" Hear, hear! "] That is a great grievance; but it has never been proposed by legislation to make these people secure against loss. It would be perfectly illogical to provide against bankruptcy in the case of injured workmen and not to provide against bankruptcy in other cases where bankruptcy creates as much suffering; and we, therefore, ought not to be asked to introduce what is really a foreign subject into our Bill. [" Hear, hear! "] I recognise and am grateful for the very frank, cordial and generous support given to the Bill by my right hon. Friend opposite. He said very truly that there was nothing consistent between the principle of this Bill and the principle of the Bill which he brought in. But there is a distinction between them. There are two classes of reformers in the world. There are reformers that want to punish somebody—[*laughter*]—and there are reformers who want to benefit somebody. [" Hear, hear! " *and laughter.*] They both of them fulfil a mission, and I do not deny that each of them is very useful occasionally in fulfilling his mission. But one party are anxious for punitive Measures; the other party are anxious for Measures of relief. That is the distinction. All Employers' Liability Bills hitherto were Bills for punishing the alleged negligence of the employers.

["Hear, hear!"] This is not a Bill which supports any idea of that kind. ["Hear, hear!"] This is a Bill for bringing relief to the injured men—[*cheers*]—and, although undoubtedly it will lay in the first instance a new liability on the employer, we believe he will be able to distribute that liability over the trade in which he is engaged. I believe that the liability under this Bill is no more, and I know in some cases it is less, than what the generous employer undertakes at present. ["Hear, hear!"] I could name hon. Members on both sides of the House who are at the present time doing more voluntarily than this Bill would impose upon them. But they do it out of their own pockets, because they do it in competition with people who do nothing. But when we have brought all employers into line the element of competition will not arise, and then it will be possible to obtain the increased cost from the consumers who use the goods. It is said that the foreign competition would still remain; but at the present time the liability on foreign employers is as great as we are imposing on our own manufacturers under this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Under these circumstances we present this Bill to the House, and we rejoice that we have received so much support from employers in the House. We know that we have the support of the workmen outside, and we, therefore, have every reason to hope that we may be able to place the Bill on the Statute Book this Session. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Baronet the Member for Durham began his speech to-night by saying that no more important Bill had been introduced during the last 50 years. He mentioned also the Free Schools Bill, and I think that the Party which has introduced these two great Measures may take some credit for being earnest in their desire to benefit the working classes of this country. [*Cheers.*] The hon. Baronet went on to say that he was only astonished that a Measure of this kind should come from the Tory Party. I might take exception to that and say we on this Bench call ourselves Unionists. [*Ministerial cheers and Opposition laughter.*] But I care nothing for that, I do not complain that the hon. Baronet will not give me the title which I claim for myself, because I refuse to him the title which he claims for himself. I refuse altogether to say that an employer of labour who is hostile to this Bill is any true representative of Liberal sentiment. [*Cheers.*] But I say that this surprise is altogether misplaced, and if he had any knowledge whatever of the political history during the last century he would not be surprised at all that the Tory Party should have brought in a Bill of this kind. [*Ministerial cheers and Opposition cries of* "Oh!"] I remember in the year 1874 I stood for Sheffield —[AN HON. MEMBER: "As a Home Ruler!"]—and certainly at that time the hon. Baronet would not have denied to me the title of an advanced Liberal, and I remember that during that Election I made it a part of my programme—[AN HON. MEMBER: "Unauthorised!"]—to do something in the direction of the social legislation which has occupied so much of our legislative time since that period, and I pointed out then to my Liberal friends that they were the most backward Party in this connection. [*Cheers.*] I pointed out again and again that it was not so with the Tory Party—I was ashamed of it then—[*laughter*]—I was ashamed that the Party to which I then belonged had been so backward in the matter, and I pointed out that all this social legislation had been initiated and to a large extent carried out by the Tory Party—["hear, hear!"]—that the Liberal Party had done a great deal in the way of political reforms for the working classes, but that so far as social legislation for their welfare was concerned almost the whole credit was due then, as it is now, to the Tory Party. [*Cheers.*] I said that in 1874, and I say it in 1897. Who introduced the whole of this factory legislation for which hon. Gentlemen opposite take all the credit?

Mr. J. SAMUEL (Stockton): Who objected to it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I have noticed that the hon. Member opposite has the most peculiar faculty of irrelevant interruption—["hear, hear!"]—that I have ever known in this House. He asks me who objected to it? Well, Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden. I believe they were Liberals. ["Hear, hear!"] It is extraordinary that the new Liberals should be so extremely ignorant of the history of their Party, and of the political history of their country. When the history of this Bill comes to be written will some hon. Member for Stockton get up then and say "Who opposed it?" and is the answer to be, "the hon. Baronet the Member for Durham, the hon. Member for Gainsborough, and other hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House?" I hope not. After all, my great anxiety is now, as it was in 1874, to see this legislation carried, and I hope hon. Gentlemen opposite have learnt their lesson and that now we may have their support where probably 20 years ago we should have had their opposition. I say this Bill is one of which any Party may well be proud. We introduce it to the House and to the country as an act of justice to, and as an act of sympathy with, the working classes of this country, and, believing that it will be recognised as such in the country, we confidently bring it forward. [*Cheers.*]

*Mr. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouth, N.), who was interrupted by cries of "Divide!" said that the discussion had been carried on with scarcely any trace of Party recrimination until the right hon. Gentleman had risen. Hon. Members on that side of the House had given far more genuine support to the Bill than hon. Members opposite. The right hon. Gentleman had condemned amendments of the Bill, though it must be admitted some amendment was desirable. But even if the Government followed the precedent established by themselves of accepting no amendment, he, for his part, would still vote for the Third Reading of the Bill. He believed it to be admirable in principle, but, as the Home Secretary had admitted, it was susceptible of amendment in several important respects.

*Colonel BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said he sympathised with the aim of the Government, but he believed the principle of the Bill to be unsound. They had adopted the German system of compensating workmen without the safeguards which made that system feasible. The principle adopted in this country had been that employer and employed should contribute to the compensation to be paid. That had been done voluntarily, and he wanted to know why the employed was no longer to contribute. All wages had been settled with reference to that arrangement. He contended that the system of payment—by both employers and employed, as in Germany—for 13 weeks should be extended to this country; and he hoped the Government would make the employed contribute towards the sum to be paid for compensation in all cases. If that were done there would be more mutuality, and the great change in the relationship of employers and employed which would be caused by throwing the whole weight on one side would be avoided.

Mr. HAROLD RECKITT (Lincolnshire, Brigg) said he wished to call attention to the case of the men who were employed in loading and unloading ships in our docks and harbours. The extent to which these men would come within the Bill would be a question of argument in Committee; but assuming that they were to come under the operation of the Bill, the question arose what were the conditions under which they were employed. Cases occurred in the river Thames, within a few miles of the place where they were now sitting, and they ought to be dealt with. He would like to mention a case which occurred lately of a barge being run down by a foreign ship in the Thames. That ship was held up in the port of London for the damage done to the barge, and was detained until security was given for the amount of the damage; but the man who was navigating the barge was drowned, and left a wife and nine children. Yet there was no process of law known in this country by means of which the widow and children of this man could get compensation out of the owner of the foreign ship for his death. No doubt an action could be brought in an English Court and a judgmen obtained, but the judgment could not be satisfied. Such cases ought to be dealt with in Committee, and he asked the sympathy of the House in support of an Amendment in that direction. He thought that when a man who fulfilled his duty met with injury he was entitled to compensation. He pressed the matter on the Government, for it was one above all Party considerations. He appealed to all who were not acquainted with this particular trade to take up a sympathetic attitude. There were many cases of great hardship where a man's family got no compensation. He concurred in the principle of the Bill, but hoped vigorous efforts would be made to amend it in the direction he had indicated. He would like to say, in conclusion, that he regretted exceedingly the tone of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who spoke on behalf of the Bill on the part of the Government. He regretted that no one had risen to criticise that speech.

Mr. DRAGE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn; Bill Read a Second time amid cheers.

On the Motion that the Committee stage be taken on Monday,

Mr. ASQUITH asked what length of time the Government proposed should elapse before the Committee stage was really entered upon? He hoped that a reasonable interval would be allowed.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider that a reasonable interval would elapse if the Committee stage were taken on Monday, but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would ask the Leader of the House a question upon the subject on Thursday.

Bill committed for Monday next.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (PERMISSIVE RATES AID) BILL.

Order for Second Reading Read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

ACCESS TO MOUNTAINS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

CHURCH PATRONAGE TRANSFER BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

SHOPS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

ACCOUNTANTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

TROUT FISHING CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

ACCOUNTANTS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

BUILDING FEUS AND LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Thursday.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till Thursday.

SALE OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

TITHE REDEMPTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a Second time, and committed for To-morrow.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till this day.

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th May 1897.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

LAND TENURE (WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. VAUGHAN DAVIES (Cardiganshire) proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time." He said that he wished the House to understand that in doing so he was not going to break through any of the ancient traditions which that Assembly so safely guarded. The House had already approved of the principle of separate legislation for Wales in connection with the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, the Welsh Intermediate Education Bill, and the Bill for the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church had been read a Second time. The same principle had also been acted upon in the case of the Welsh Land Commission, which had been appointed to inquire into the conditions of land tenure in that country. In bringing forward this Measure he desired that it should be thoroughly understood that he was actuated by no political object, and had not adopted that course for Party purposes. It had been asserted that the Measure had been promoted with the object of getting up an agitation in Wales, but that was not the fact. This important question had been before the Welsh people for the last 25 years. In 1883 the North Wales Property Defence Association had passed a Resolution declaring that the time had arrived when a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the incidence of land tenure in Wales, but that Resolution was not acted upon until 1893, when such a Commission was appointed by Mr. Gladstone's Government. There could be no doubt that land hunger had taken a strong hold upon the people of Wales, as was clearly shown by the evidence that had been given before the Welsh Land Commission. Why was it that the people of Wales had got into their minds such a strong longing for the land? In endeavouring to answer that question they must remember that there were at the present time 500,000 people in Wales who could not speak the English language; and being, therefore, debarred from obtaining employment in England, were compelled to engage in agriculture in their own country. Another consideration was that in Wales there were only 3,000,000 of acres of land available for cultivation, which gave an average of less than 50 acres for each of the 65,000 Welsh agriculturists. Welshmen were undoubtedly influenced by a strong love of country, but it was only through their determination to work and to live harder than the English labourers that the Welsh agriculturists were able to pay their way. He was most anxious to do full justice to the Welsh landlords, but even they would admit that the agricultural land in Wales was too highly rented, and that this was the case was proved by the fact that at rent audit day they almost invariably returned to the tenants from 5 to 15 per cent. of the rent. This reduction of rent was carried out upon no regular system, and, therefore, the farmers never knew really how much rent they would be called upon to pay; and they had to live upon the good will of their landlords. Another subject that largely affected the Welsh tenant farmers was the way in which notices to quit were served upon them. In 1868 these notices fell upon the tenants like a shower of snow simply for political reasons. The tenants were, moreover, subject to receive these notices merely upon the ground that their landlord's gamekeeper had alleged that they had shot a rabbit or a cock pheasant. How could farmers be expected to cultivate their farms properly in such circumstances as that. ["Hear, hear!"] Within the last year or so they had had another illustration of the manner in which Welsh landlords used this power of eviction. It was well known that farmers who had given evidence before the Welsh Land Commission had been turned out of their farms in consequence of their having done so, and yet no landlord had been prosecuted for taking such a step, although the Act under which the Royal

Commission was appointed imposed a fine of £100 or three months' imprisonment upon any landlord who evicted his tenant for such a reason. The only way to protect the Welsh tenant was to establish a Welsh Land Court which would be able to give the tenants security of tenure and compensation for improvements. It was no use to trust to voluntary action in reference to the land question in Wales, and any legislation on the subject must be of a compulsory character. He maintained that all Voluntary Laws were rotten. It was useless to talk to Welshmen of voluntary laws or boards of conciliation after the rebuff the President of the Board of Trade received in the case of the North Wales quarrymen. If conciliation failed in such a matter as that it would fail also in reference to landlords and tenant farmers. Welshmen believed that nothing short of a Land Court with compulsory powers would ever do any good. It was proposed to construct such a Court on the lines of the County Court, for the sake of economy. There they would have all the machinery ready to hand, except that instead of the judge being a lawyer, he would be an agricultural judge appointed and paid by the Board of Agriculture, from a list of names supplied by each County Council. His suspension or removal was to be at the discretion of the Department, which he hoped was sufficient proof of the desire of the promoters of the Bill to keep him free from all outside pressure. The decisions of the agricultural judge were to be final, except in points of law, which would be referred to the County Court Judge, whose decision would be final. Each Court was to keep a tenant holdings' book, in which every judgment and order of the Court was to be recorded, as well as the state of the farm when taken over, and the improvements done by the landlord, and every tenant after the passing of the Bill would become a judicial tenant, neither party having power to contract out of the Bill. The Board of Agriculture would determine the district of the Court in which each agricultural judge should act. Then came the very important question of rent. Under the present system farmers bid recklessly against one another, knowing full well they could not pay the rent they offered, and simply hoping they would get a reduction from the landlord. It was proposed, therefore, that the agricultural judge should go over the farm and place a rent upon it which would have to be paid within a month of its becoming due, and which would remain in force for a term of five years, and would continue in force after the expiration of the term unless a fresh application were made by either party. Then came a question of immense importance, the question of agreements. Under the Bill it was proposed to give the farmer a free hand to farm as he liked and sell what he liked, so long as he returned sufficient manure on the land. In his evidence before the Commission Major Birch said:—

> "I would not be interfered with as regards any course of cropping. I am speaking as a practical farmer now. I would not sign an agreement that interfered with me, if I did not know it was going to be a dead letter."

The agent of the Bodorgan estates, referring to the oppressive clauses in his own agreements, said they were never used, and might as well go out. They were only incumbrances. Mr. Wynn, late agent of the Wynnstay Estates, said:—

> "There is not an agreement on any estate in the country, I think, which cannot be remodelled, I think, to a very great advantage; and if I were to take up an agency again, I believe I could write a perfectly satisfactory agreement on a sheet of notepaper."

So under the Bill all those silly clauses would be done away with. ["Hear, hear!"] It was, however, desired to leave a certain amount of freedom of contract under the Bill, and power would be reserved to the landlord and tenant to come to a mutual, reasonable agreement. Such an agreement would, however, have to be recorded in the tenants' holding book, and would become a judicial tenancy as if ordered by the Court. He now came to the question of improvements. Under the present law it was next to impossible for the tenant to get them allowed. It was too expensive a process for him. Under this Bill the matter would be settled by the Agricultural Court on easy and inexpensive terms. In the same way the landlord's right to dilapidations would be equally guarded, and he would also have the right to acquire land for building cottages, for gardens, planting and working materials, with, of course, proper reductions of rent. ["Hear, hear!"] The landowner would also have the right to take into his own hands or to put into the hands of one of his family, a farm for permanent occupation, paying the outgoing tenant for all his improvements, and for disturbance; and to prevent fraud, the landowner or his relative would have to live on the farm for three years or pay double compensation to the tenant turned out. ["Hear, hear!"] His aim and object in the introduction of the Bill had been to try and deal honestly and fairly between landlord and tenant, and to place the farmers of Wales on a more honourable and secure footing than they now held. He begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea Boroughs) supported the Motion. He desired to call the attention of the House to the special circumstances in regard to land tenure in Wales, as a very different condition of things existed in the Principality from that which existed in most of the English counties. The Bill did not propose to create any tenant right that did not already exist. It did not give to the tenant of the holdings to which the Bill applied the right of free sale, and they asserted, therefore, that no part of the capital value of the land, or of any capital expended by the landlord in improving the land, was under the operation of this Bill transferred from the landlord's pocket to the tenant's pocket. This Welsh land question was no new thing. There had never been a more fallacious notion propagated by the Press of this country, or advocated by Party politicians, than the notion that the Welsh land question was a mere Party political agitation in servile imitation of the Irish action. ["Hear, hear!"] The Commission had reported unanimously combined with the English system of land tenure, tenure from year to year, combined with the English system of estate management had been in vogue there had been the gravest dissatisfaction among the Welsh people. More than 50 years ago, at the time of the civil disturbances known as the Rebecca riots, the very same demand for fair rents on their holdings was advanced by the peasants and farmers as was advanced now. The prevalent tenure of agricultural land in Wales had worked with gross injustice to the tenant farmers, and had created a substantial grievance which could only be remedied by legislation on some such lines as they now proposed. The operation of this system of land tenure had resulted in an unjustifiable increase of rent, and an unfair division of the profits of the agricultural industry which was carried on jointly by landlord and tenant. It had had the effect of confiscating the improvements made by the labour and capital of the tenants and their ancestors on some holdings; it had hampered the industry by the imposition of unreasonable conditions; and had materially disturbed the happiness and peace of the Welsh peasantry. The actual nature of the system was too well known in that House to need more than a passing reference. Nearly the whole of Wales was now under cultivation, and the system of estate management was more or less that adopted in the English counties. The landlord was supposed to—and in many cases did—make the permanent improvements and the more important repairs, while the tenant stocked the farm and supplied the necessary capital and labour for working it. It was not until the end of the last century that this system of estate management and of tenure from year to year began to become prevalent in the Principality. Nearly 90 per cent. of the occupiers of the soil were tenants from year to year. He attacked the whole system of land tenure as it existed in Wales. The first and most noticeable thing was the comparative smallness of the holdings. The holdings from 20 to 50 acres were 20'48 in Wales as compared with 14'74 per cent. in England. The holdings from 50 to 100 acres were 16'69 per cent. in Wales as compared with 10'82 per cent. in England. In Wales, moreover, the holdings went down as low as from three to five acres. Then the next point was the smallness of the Welsh farmers' labour bill, the proportion of in-door to out-door labour being much greater in Wales than in England. The typical Welsh farmer worked with his labourers, and depended also very largely on the labour of his wife, and even of his young children, who ought to be at school. The whole organisation of the farm had a family character. In one case the Commission found that a grandfather, a son and his wife, three grandsons, and several great-grandchildren were living on one small farm. Another noticeable point was the almost insatiable land hunger which existed in Wales. This feeling was not only prompted by the desire to carry on farming avocations, but by the passionate attachment of the Welsh people to the soil on which their forefathers had lived for generations. That was an element which any sound statesmanship must take into account. The Commission unanimously reported that derelict farms were unknown in Wales. There was practically no land that was cultivable that could not be let, but, on the other hand, holdings that were really not worth cultivating existed in great numbers. Colonel Hughes, the agent for the Wynnstay estate, in giving evidence before the Commission, referred sympathetically to the struggles of the farmers on such holdings. He would have left this matter there but for the fact that the hon. Member for Shropshire had in a recent Debate denied the existence of this land hunger. The fact was that even since the depression set in there was no lack of demand for Welsh farms. He might give many instances but would take a few. The agent of Lord Kenyon's estate in Shropshire said that he had on his books at the time he was giving evidence between 30 and 40 names of eligible men willing to take any farm on the estate. Sir Joseph Bailey told them that in 1893, the period of acute agricultural depression, he had 20 applications for a vacant farm in Brecknockshire, and it was also shown that for a farm near Cowbridge, in Glamorganshire, which recently fell vacant, there were 24 applications. For a farm in Cardiganshire there were 59 or 60 applications. Another remarkable economic fact in regard to the land of Wales was the long duration of tenancies, or, in other words, the hereditary character of the connection of particular families with the same holding. In listening to the many witnesses before the Commission, nothing struck him more than the testimony in that regard. The Wynnstay estate consisted of several parcels of land which were divided into five or six separate estates. On one estate there were two farms which had been in the same holding for 400 years; five farms for between 300 and 400 years; three from 150 to 250 years. That gave an average in the ten cases of 286 years. On another estate nine farms had been in the same holding for between 100 and 200 years; five for between 200 and 300 years; and one for 400 years. It was credibly believed that one farm had been in the occupation of one family for about 1,000 years. [*Cheers.*] That statement was cheered, but the explanation was that down to the end of the last century the relations between landlord and tenant were those of customary tenure, and not of competitive tenure, and that the moment the latter system came into operation, there were continual changes in the tenancies. There was, for instance, one old estate which presented precisely the same phenomena as the Wynnstay estate. It changed hands about 20 years ago. The purchaser, who paid about £36,000 for the estate, was a humane man; he intended to do his best by the tenantry, and he spent his money freely in making improvements. The estate consisted of 25 farms. Twenty years ago 25 Welsh families lived on the estate, but now there were only four of the original tenants. The next thing he would like to mention as a peculiarity of Wales was that, owing to historic circumstances into which he could not go very minutely now, a very much larger share—an exceptionally large share—of the improvements made upon the holdings had been made by the expenditure of the capital of the tenant rather than of the landlord. Since the beginning of this century, the English system of management had gradually come into operation, but it was an odd thing that quite recently the tenants from year to year in Anglesey were found making permanent improvements. In its operation the system prevailing in Wales had resulted in large and continuous raising of rent by means of revaluations, in which the tenants' share of the improvements had been ignored, or by actual evictions or voluntary withdrawals without adequate compensation. Some years ago, when his hon. Friend the Member for Merionethshire introduced his Bill relating to Welsh land, considerable controversy arose as to the question of increase of rent. All the difficulties had now been cleared away, as the figures had been ascertained. The first time that the income tax was levied upon the rental of real property was 1814-15. Comparing the returns under Schedule A for that year and for the different decades from 1842-43 down to the present time, he found that in the case of the county of Anglesey the gross rents of agricultural land had increased by 142·8 per cent. The figures did not relate to houses or tenements, or to any holding of less than two acres. In Carnarvonshire the increase amounted to 101·3; in Merionethshire to 73·9; in Pembrokeshire to 93·1 per cent., and in Radnorshire to 63·4 per cent. In Wales, excluding Monmouthshire, generally, the increase was 66·9 per cent., and in Wales and Monmouthshire 63·2 per cent. [An hon. Member: "Is that for the same land, or for an additional quantity of land?"] If additional land had been brought into cultivation that might account for the rent going up; some allowance would have to be made. Their proposition was that there had been a very large and a very unfair increase of rent; that it involved the exploiting of the tenant farmer by the landlord's monopoly, and that the rent paid did not represent what would be the true rent, if an economic account were taken on a proper basis, between the landlord and the tenant. The next point was that these rents had gone on continually increasing from 1814-15 up to 1882-83. As might have been expected, from the fact that the great agricultural depression made itself felt a little later than in England, about 1880-81 there came a fall in the returns under Schedule A for 1882-83. The fall for the decade 1882-83 to 1892-93 in the whole of Wales, as distinct from Monmouthshire, was only 6·2, and in Wales and Monmouthshire 6·3, and, in comparison, he should like to say that, after the most minute investigation, the Commission came to the conclusion that, if they averaged the fall in prices over all the ordinary produce of Welsh farms, the fall from 1880 to 1893-94 was about 33 per cent. He asked the House to bear in mind how comparatively small had been the percentage of fall of gross rental as compared with the fall in prices. He also wanted to make one comparison between the reduction of rent, as it appeared on the basis of these tables, in England and in Wales. The Commission took nine counties which on the whole seemed most nearly to resemble the economic circumstances of the 13 counties of Wales. They found that, while in England rent had decreased, as judged by these returns, by 23·7 per cent. since 1879-80, when the depression made itself generally felt, in Wales and Monmouthshire the decrease had only been 7·1 per cent., showing that the abatements of the English landlords had been much more generous than the abatements of the Welsh landlords. Apart from the question of rent, which was practically at the root of the whole matter, there had been a good deal of virtual confiscation of improvements by revaluation. That was a practical point on which all the Commissioners were agreed. They found that the way in which, upon sale or succession, the holdings were revalued under the existing law was extremely unjust to the tenant. It might be asked why did not the tenants, when they received notice to quit at the time of a sale, come under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883; but here again their extreme land hunger and the temper of the people came into play. If they pursued that course, it would inevitably be taken by the agent of the estate, or by the agent of the new purchaser, as an indication that they wanted to leave the estate, or that they were a grumbling set of people whom it would be well to get rid of. There was one thing he ought to say of a general kind. The insecurity of tenure from year to year poisoned the whole life of the tenant farming class, and had a distinctly disastrous effect upon the general character of the people. They were so impressed with this, that they had actually found the tenants, apparently free men, were afraid to come before the Commission to give evidence. He was not going to say that there was any absolute justification for their fears. He believed that the Welsh tenants on the larger estates might have come forward without any fear of injury to their interests or of eviction, but the Commission found that the 13 counties they went into were permeated with this fear and suspicion of the landlord and the agent, and that operated in the most injurious way upon the peace and happiness of the tenant farming classes of Wales. He did not suppose it could be denied that there were grievances, and the question arose how were they to be remedied. Two remedies had been suggested. The first was the creation by a system of land purchase, on a considerable scale, of a peasant proprietary. The other was the regulation of the agricultural industry. He had come to the conclusion, after visiting these counties, that a man was very much better off as a tenant upon an estate, if he was only paying a fair rent and had reasonable security of tenure, than he was as an occupying freeholder. It seemed to him that most of the occupying freeholders of Wales had simply exchanged the sway of the landlord for the sway of the mortgagee, and he, for one, did not think the true solution for the difficulty was to be found in the creation of a peasant proprietary. He was firmly of opinion that the true and statesmanlike way of dealing with the question was to regulate the industry. He said "regulate the industry" advisedly, because there was no such great and essential difference between the operations of the agricultural industry and other industries. The same principles which had led Parliament to pass Acts for the protection of workers, like the Factory Acts, the Workshops Act, and the Coal Mines Regulation Act, really applied to landlord and tenant under this system. Landlord and tenant were partners, and the main gravamen that he made against this system, quite apart from the special circumstances of Wales, was that it inevitably tended to an unfair division of the profits between landlord and tenant. An eminent economist, the late Professor Walker, himself inclined to favour the principle of freedom of contract, had said:—

> "Wherever there is a peasantry unfitted for competition upon commercial principles with a powerful and wealthy class under a painful pressure of population, there the regulation of the holding of land becomes a proper matter for State regulation."

He claimed that the circumstances of Wales which he had mentioned disclosed a state of things that came within that proposition. He claimed to have shown, upon indisputable facts, without raising any matters of unpleasant controversy in regard to any estate in Wales, that the condition of things there justified their demand for separate legislation. He should like the House to remember that the whole of the Land Commissioners, though their solutions were different, found that a case for separate legislation had been made out. But though they were asking for separate legislation for Wales, both upon economic and historic grounds, they were not demanding it in any separatist spirit. Their policy was a differential, and not a separatist policy. He was convinced it would be found that, whether this Bill passed or not, no part of the United Kingdom was more desirous of maintaining the strength of the great empire to which they belonged than the 13 counties with which he had been dealing. But they said they were entitled to have their particular characteristics observed. The farmhouses of Wales had been the nurseries of a gifted and sturdy race. The meaning of their Bill, imperfect though it might be, was that they were seriously asking the House to help them to keep the homes of the Welsh people for the Welsh people themselves. The strength of the Empire did not depend upon the uniformity of law. It depended upon the perpetuation of the race, upon a continuous line of capable and vigorous citizens, and what he claimed for the Bill was that that would be its effect, and that, if it were passed, the strength of the Empire would be largely maintained by the present tenant farmers of Wales and their descendants.

MR. POWLETT MILBANK (Radnor) proposed to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months." He claimed for himself and his Friends on the Government side of the House the same earnest desire to see the tenant farmers of Wales happy and prosperous as he gave hon. Members opposite credit for. Only they looked at the question from a different point of view. They did not wish separate legislation for Wales, and he did not see that any case had been shown, or any just demand made out, for a Bill to establish a Land Court for the Principality. The legislation on fair rent and Land Courts for Ireland did not satisfy either side of the House, and the experiment would be equally unsatisfactory in the case of Wales. No warrant had been shown for the Bill from agricultural depression, which had been less severe in Wales than anywhere. From a Return showing the variation in the income tax valuation for the period 1879 to 1894 he found that reductions of 10 per cent. had been made in only eight counties of Wales, and reductions of over 10 and under 20 per cent. in two counties only. It was evident, therefore, that agricultural depression had not been felt so strongly in Wales as in England. Let him criticise the Bill itself for a few moments. First, as to the constitution of the Land Court. His hon. Friend explained that an agricultural Judge was to conduct the procedure of the Court in the same way as a County Court Judge. It was hardly possible he could do that, for in 99 cases out of a hundred he would have no legal knowledge, so that they would fail at once in the constitution of the Court. Then as to the appointment of the agricultural Judges. As he understood the Bill the Judges were to be recommended by the County Councils. He did not want to tread on delicate and dangerous ground, for he had to acknowledge the great moderation with which the Bill had been brought in and seconded. But most of the Welsh County Councils were—without using the term offensively—ultra-Radical, and it was only natural that their nominees, though excellent men, would be biassed by their political opinions. For his own part he certainly should not like to trust his interests in the hands of the gentlemen who would be appointed by the County Councils of Wales. Moreover, this provision would make County Council elections even more productive of bitter feeling than they had been. Then the Judges were required to speak Welsh. That would absolutely disqualify the whole of his constituency, because he did not believe there was a man in Radnorshire who spoke a solitary word of Welsh. [*Laughter.*] Further, the Judge must have a perfect knowledge of the district upon which he pronounced a decision. It was impossible, therefore, that they could have an agricultural Judge in his county. From the first letter of the Bill to the last, he disliked it thoroughly. [*Welsh cheers.*] It was as well to be straightforward. ["Hear, hear!"] He took it that the effect of the clause empowering the Court to determine fair rent and conditions of tenancy would be to abolish all existing conditions of tenancy. That meant that property was to be no longer respected, and that two sensible men were to be no longer allowed to make an agreement with each other. It was almost saying that the landlord was screwing out the highest possible rent, or that the tenant was a fool who was not capable of managing his own affairs. The Bill would do no good, certainly not in the county in which he resided, and it would cause an enormous amount of ill-feeling between landlord and tenant. Of the provisions for recasting agreements, he approved; but it did not do much to encourage free contract. The Court might refuse to record the settlement; but while he should suppose it would never do that, they had the professional agitator sometimes even in Wales, and he was not likely to calmly look on and let landlord and tenant agree—he was sure to say the terms were unreasonable. He disliked the Bill for many reasons, but chiefly because it would destroy, or partly destroy, that good feeling which now existed between landlord and tenant. The Welsh landlords wished to see their tenantry prosperous, and as far as he knew them—and he had had dealings with many of them —he had always found them deal in a most generous spirit with all their tenants. As a rule they did the whole of the improvements. ["No!"] He was speaking of the ordinary landlord. No doubt in North Wales the tenants would do a lot of improvements themselves. ["Hear, hear!" *from the* WELSH MEMBERS.] He should not mind seeing the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 amended so as to absolutely compensate the tenant for everything he laid out on permanent improvements. That he was entirely in favour of; but he was not in favour of a Bill that provided a third party to step in and undo that friendly feeling which had always existed. The landlords at present took an interest in their property, but what would be the effect if they practically took the whole management of their property out of their hands? They would only look on the tenant as a sort of machine for paying rent on a certain day. Then as to the tenants. If they got settled for a term of five years, how about bad times? Would the tenants have to keep their farms in repair? ["Yes!"] As far as he knew the landlord at present did the whole of the repairs, but if the tenants had to do all repairs for the five years, they would be very little better off under fair rent than they were at this moment. He opposed the Bill, and moved that it be read that day six months, because he felt certain that it would cause great ill-feeling between landlord and tenant, because it did that it would cause great ill-feeling because it would do an excessive amount of harm. Although he would willingly support anything in the shape of an Amendment of the Act of 1883, but this Bill it was impossible that he or any of his Friends should support.

Sir J. LLEWELYN (Swansea) said the views of those who had spoken for the Bill on the other side had been very temperately put before the House. It brought into the front the controversy that raged before the Land Commission in 1892-95. If hon. Gentlemen would take the trouble to read the long and interesting Report of that Commission, they would find that the principal difference between the majority and the minority of the Commissioners rested upon this very point—the question whether a Land Court was necessary or not. He for one should not be prepared to rest upon the present position of land tenure in Wales, because he thought that injustice had been done under it, and was likely to be continued unless a reform took place. But he held that a reform could be brought about by an amended Agricultural Holdings Act; and he thought it a *sine quâ non* that this improvement of the Agricultural Holdings Act should be passed at the earliest possible moment. They had had a promise from Her Majesty's Government that some Amendment of the law should be submitted to the House which should apply to England as to Wales; and he would venture to ask the House to bear in mind the words used in the Report of the Commission, in regard to the question of separate legislation for Wales and England. What they said was this:—

> "We had as Commissioners no right to pronounce on the question whether an amendment of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 and of the law of landlord and tenant as to agricultural holdings is required for England as well as Wales. It was not in our reference. But, without prejudice to the question, we think that the circumstances disclosed in regard to Wales by our inquiry urgently call for legislation such as we have above sketched."

He did not intend to go back upon those words. If justice were not done to Wales by general legislation which should cover the whole of England and Wales he should then be quite prepared to support separate legislation for Wales. But how could he do this in face of the promise of the Government that the whole question should be considered as one case? He disliked separate treatment, and he thought that justice would be done to all sections in the country. In the very able and interesting speech delivered by the hon. Member for the Swansea District, they had been told that the principal differences between land tenure in Wales and England were first of all, the insatiable land hunger in Wales. He had himself been brought up from a child on landed property in Wales, and he knew what that land hunger was. If a farm were vacant he knew that in many places there would at once be a dozen applicants for it. But it had been almost the universal custom on the large estates of Wales for the tenants to occupy their farms from father to son, and there had rarely been anything in the way of an increase of rent when the occupation had been kept in the same family. In the case of a family becoming extinct—which was very rare—there was a large number of applicants for the vacant farm, and it was that which constituted land hunger. The conditions of various parts of Wales were so different that they could hardly treat those separate portions of the Principality on the same basis of equality without some consideration of the different conditions of tenure. They must deal with the strictly pastoral as compared with the agricultural parts of Wales in dealing with this question. The men throughout the whole of Wales were thrifty and hardworking, and he could not think they would like the suggestion of the hon. Member opposite who had recommended that the present system of payment of rent six months after date should be altered for a payment on the exact day that the amount fell due. The present custom had gone on from father to son, and he believed it was conceived in its inception by considerations of the best interests of the tenants themselves. If this Bill were carried, and the Land Court introduced, what would be the position of landlord and tenant? It seemed to him to follow as a matter of course that whichever of the two parties took the other into court, would do so at a time suited to his convenience. Hitherto the whole system of charging rents had been conducted by the persons who knew the circumstances best—namely, the landlord and tenant, without the intervention of a third party; and the two main objects of desiring judicial rents fixed in Wales were shattered by the conditions of the Principality. The conditions in Wales were altogether different from those which prevailed in Ireland. In the Principality, for instance, the main repairs, the buildings, outbuildings, and everything that was necessary for the occupancy of the farm were paid for by the landlord, with the exception of a few notable instances, especially in Anglesey, the interests of which county he held ought to be, and could be, safeguarded by an Amendment of the Agricultural Holdings Act. The other point, which differentiated Wales from Ireland, was that absenteeism was practically unknown in the former. Almost every landowner delighted to live among his tenantry, because of the good feeling which existed between landlord and tenant. He had a very strong impression that the introduction of a Land Court would destroy the good feeling between landlord and tenant. He did not wish to accentuate any difference of politics or religion in the controversy at all, and as some evidence had been quoted, he would quote the evidence of one witness who came before the Commission, that of Mr. Edward Davies, of Llandinam, who certainly, he believed, was neither a Tory nor a Churchman. He said that—

> "self-help and self-reliance—which are in the powers of all—are more effective than any external aid by means of legislation or otherwise."

Dealing with the question of a Land Court, Mr. Davies said:—

> "With regard to the proposal to establish a Land Court, I am of opinion that with the friction, litigation, and worry which would unavoidably be connected with it, the result would tend to place land in a worse position than any ordinary commercial enterprise. The landlord would have to look mainly to the question of return for his capital, and as that would be periodically subject to depreciation from what he would consider an arbitrary valuation, without any adequate rule, basis, or standard to guide the valuer, he would necessarily confine his expenditure upon buildings and improvements to its narrowest limit."

Further on Mr. Davies said that if a Land Court were established,

> "Then the only tolerable alternative would be for the tenant to become sole owner, for rather than submit to an uncertain valuation, which may be unjust and arbitrary, I, as a landlord, would prefer the risks of selling my property."

Mr. Davies was, he believed, one of the best landlords in Wales, but supposing that other landowners were to put their properties in the market in the same sense that Mr. Davies was prepared to recommend, there would be a widespread consternation throughout Wales, because the tenants with the freedom of contract which now obtained were much better off than they would be under any Land Court, and if they would take his advice they would keep clear of law and of lawyers. [*Laughter.*] It was far better for them whenever they found they could not pay their rent to go straight to their landlord, as they had done for generations and centuries past, and obtain a temporary or permanent reduction, than to go into Court, which would necessarily involve them in costs. He believed that the reason why the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 had been inoperative was because tenants had been afraid to go into Court, as they knew perfectly well that costs were involved by such a procedure. They had in the past rested upon the good feeling which existed between landlord and tenant rather than resort to a proceeding which would inevitably result in legal expense. The Bill appeared to him to open a new way by which law costs would be incurred, and, while it might be food for the lawyers, it would be poison to the farmers.

On the return of Mr. Speaker, after the usual interval,

*Mr. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) said that he supported the Second Reading of this Bill because he could see no other way of extricating Welsh farmers from the ruinous position in which they were placed. Their rents were far too high.

Their capital had been almost exhausted by the vain attempt to pay these impossible rents, and the system of agriculture had deteriorated very much for want of farming capital and from the wretched system of yearly tenancy that prevailed. The Returns collected by the Land Commission showed conclusively how impossibly high the rents were. The rise of rents in all England from 1815 to 1893 was 16·3 per cent., but in Wales and Monmouthshire it was 63·2 per cent. The fall from the highest point of rent was 18 per cent. in England, and 6·3 per cent. in Wales and Monmouthshire. The real cause of this difference was not the character of the agriculture, but the land hunger in Wales, and the opportunity it gave of exacting unreasonable rents. There was a very close analogy between the condition of Welsh farming now, and that of Ireland before the Land Acts of Mr. Gladstone. The excessive competition for land in Ireland enabled the landlords to screw impossible rents out of the poor peasantry. So it was in Wales today. The absence of leases, or of security for tenants' improvements made good farming impossible in Ireland, and so it was in Wales to-day. The landlords in Ireland belonged to a different Church, and different side of politics from their tenants; so it was in Wales to-day. The Welsh farmers were usually Nonconformists and Liberals; the landlords were Anglicans and Tories. There was incessant friction in Ireland, and a miserable social condition; it was less so in Wales, but still there was far too much of it. The elementary fact in both cases was that there was no security against excessive rents and capricious evictions in Wales any more than there was in Ireland, and as peace and contentment had been secured to Ireland by a system of judicial rents, so it would be in Wales. In support of these views he would quote from the Report of the Land Commission:—

> "But though there are points of difference between the condition of Ireland and the condition of Wales, yet there are many points of resemblance. There is the same land hunger exhibited in almost, if not quite, as great a degree. There is the same attachment to the native land, and to the pursuit of farming under the same traditional conditions. There is much of the same divergence in temperament, idiosyncracy, and habits between the actual cultivators of the soil and the aristocratic class who own the land. There is the same hostility, more veiled but not less felt, to the agents of the landlord. Religious and social differences between the cultivators and the owners are just as well marked in Wales as they were in Ireland, if, indeed, not more highly developed. There is the same fear among the tenants that they may be ousted from homes to which they are passionately attached. There is the same conviction that the pressure of legal rules and economic circumstances is depriving them unjustly of the fruits of their labour."

He could assert from his knowledge of his own constituency that the farmers were being ground to death between the upper and nether millstones of excessive rents and excessive competition for land. In many cases the farmer and his whole family toiled on the land from early morn till dark, and earned far less than they could get as agricultural labourers; their food was very poor, they were poorly clad, and had no luxuries; and no class of people in Great Britain got so small a reward for their industry. Most farms were still held at the high rents of 20 years ago, with occasional rebates of 10 and sometimes of 15 per cent., which were already being reduced in proportion to the relief given by the Agricultural Rating Act of last year; but if the tenants were dealt with on the same plan as Irish tenants, the reductions would be not 10 or 15 per cent., but 40 per cent. He also advocated the change on social grounds. The very backbone of a country was its agricultural population. The true policy of any country should be to keep a large population on the land, and to encourage the best farming possible. The policy of this country had been just the opposite: hence the depletion of the agricultural population and the enormous increase of our cities. The greatest economical reform of the future would be that which would attract population to the soil and develop its resources to the largest extent possible. This policy should be applied to all parts of the United Kingdom; but at the present moment it was most imperatively demanded in Wales. They had the advantage of the Report of a Land Commission representing all classes, and the Government were asked to give effect to the Report of that Commission, which was embodied in the Bill now before the House. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that as the hon. Member had no connection with Wales, except political, he suggested that this Bill was applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom. Then why was not the Bill brought forward for the whole of England? ["Hear, hear!"] He believed that he was the only man in the House who had read the Report of the Welsh Land Commission. [*Cries of* "No," *and laughter.*] At any rate, no one could could have read it who had not very ample leisure. It was a remarkable report written in seven languages—Greek, Latin, French, German, Ogmic, Celtic, and a little English. [*Laughter.*] And still the wonder grew, that nine small heads could carry all they knew. [*Laughter.*] The first recommendation was that Her Majesty should put the Record Office in order, although there was not a single manuscript in Welsh in that office. The next inquiry was whether there were Goidels in Wales, or whether there was a Pre-Goidelic nationality; a third question turned upon a point of comparative philology which was thus treated: The Goidelic for *who* is in Manx Gaelic *quei*, *quoi*, but in Welch *pwy*: compare Latin *quī*, *quis*, Oscan *pis*, accusative *pim*. Similarly the Goidelic for *five* is in Manx *queig*, but in Welch *pump* (and *pimp*). Compare Latin *quinque*, whence the derivatives *quintus* 'fifth,' *Quintus* (for *quinctus*, *Quinctus*), and *Quinctus*, *Quintius*, which we have as an Oscan name in Πομπτιες, Latinized *Pomptius*, and *Pontius* as in the well-known name of the Samnite *Pontius* Pilate. The relative morality of the Pictish and Roman ladies was illustrated by a quotation from Dion Cassius; and then followed chapters on the Ogmic alphabet, the orographical survey of Wales, and its geological, biological, municipal, and climatic conditions. A personal inspection of the tombstones in the graveyards of Wales enabled the Commissioners to produce original evidence of the longevity of the inhabitants. [*Laughter.*] Perhaps some hon. Member would be good enough to inform the House how all this affected the hill-side farms of Wales. ["Hear, hear!"] The Report then passed to the laws of Howell the Good, in the 10th century, and made this important discovery—that no value was attached to a hare in old days because the hare had two sexes which changed every month. [*Laughter.*] If the Commissioners could show that this applied to the higher animals in Wales, they would have established some foundation for differentiation of Wales from the rest of the United Kingdom, and perhaps in favour of female suffrage itself. [*Laughter.*] The Report next dealt fully with the strange habits of the Welsh people described as "streccio," "cnocio," "fenstern," and "bundling," and illustrated the improved morality of the Welsh by stating that now it was a disgrace to be found drunk—drawing a fine distinction between being drunk and getting drunk and being found out. [*Laughter.*] The manner in which the Welsh spent their Sunday next engaged the attention of the Commissioners, ending by a description of a religious revival in these words:—

> "The whole congregation is either moved to exceeding ecstasy under a vivid realisation of things invisible, or uncontrollable terror by discovery of their lost condition."

At last he came to a real oasis in the desert—a chapter on the subject of rent and ownership. It was stated that:—

> "In the King and Queen of England is vested the eminent domain or paramount ownership of the soil. . . . An estate is an economic unit, an industrial and organic entity having a life of its own."

All of which was very helpful. [*Laughter.*] Then ten pages were devoted to Professor Walker on Ricardo's "Theory of Rent," and there was a whole chapter on John Stuart Mill's "Political Economy." The Commissioners, however, were good enough to put into a nutshell the whole theory of rent so that any stupid man might comprehend it. They said:—

> "Now assume Y exceeds X by Z." [*Laughter.*] "Then if the landlord claims Z as rent and that is payable, there is no interest on the tenant's capital and he is a loser. If Z is so large that a fair interest can be paid on capital A, then the surplus can be paid to the landlord."

[*Laughter.*] After that every one must know what was a fair economic rent. [*Laughter.*] From those premises the Commissioners came to the conclusion that the agricultural conditions of England and Wales were identical, and that the Welsh rents had not been reduced in the same proportion as rents in England. Let them hear for themselves the real facts taken from the income tax returns. In Monmouth the reduction had been 16·2; in Devonshire, 13·9; in Denbigh, 14·7; in Westmorland, 13·8; in Radnor, 13·4; in Cumberland, 12·1; in Brecon, 12·8; in Cornwall, 6·2: ; in Flint, 11·7; and in Cheshire, 6·07. On those figures he charged the Commissioners with an untrue statement, the Commissioners asserted that the agricultural depression in Wales was identical with the depression in England. But Mr. Doyle, a most impartial authority, a Poor Law Inspector, and a Radical, said in his evidence before the Richmond Commission:—"The depression is neither so severe nor so general in Wales as in England." Next came the assertion that such was the land hunger in Wales and the competition for farms that the tenants had no chance. Mr. Doyle, on the contrary, stated that "the almost exclusive use of the Welsh language amongst the class of small farmers gives Welshmen in far-away parts almost a monopoly of land-holding;" and he went on to say, "The restricted competition for farms compels owners in too many cases to accept undesirable tenants." The fondness of the Welsh people for home and their dislike to migrate had been dwelt on by several hon. Members in the course of the Debate. But Mr. Doyle asserted that the younger members of Welsh families emigrate and migrate without hesitation. Another thing they did; when they crossed the border they rarely came back. [*Laughter.*] It was with a blush that he had read in the Report of the Commission, "strapping Welsh wenches were in great demand in London." [*Laughter.*] He did not wish to minimise Welsh agricultural grievances. He participated in them himself. Nor did he wish that any one should suppose that depression had not been heavy on the Welsh tenant. ["Hear, hear!"] But what did the Bill do to remedy their condition? In the first place, it abolished freedom of contract, which was the mainstay of the agricultural industry, and the greatest safeguard to the tenants. The effect of the Bill would be to raise rents on all those estates where rents were below the average. He believed it had already created widespread alarm amongst the tenants, because on many of the large estates in Wales the rents were below the average of rents around. The Bill would lead to wholesale ejectment of farmers whose methods of farming was below the average. The Commissioners in their Report declared that the average farmer in Wales did not do justice to the land, because he was hindered by want of capital, want of education and want of energy. He would not follow the example of members of the Commission by throwing dirt on the Welsh tenantry. ["Hear, hear!"] Again, the Bill proposed to create a triple ownership, that of the landlord, that of the tenant, and that of the County Court. The tenant would be under two sets of agents, the Commission having declared that no one individual could combine all the qualities necessary in a good agent. Rents were to be fixed by guesswork. The promoters of the Bill had not the courage or intelligence to say how a fair rent should be assessed, and they got out of the difficulty by not stating any method, standard, or principle. The Bill discouraged improvements. The owner had to apply to the Court for leave to build a cottage, to grant an allotment, to make a cottage garden, or even to build a house for himself. The Bill altogether ignored the interests of the labourer, and divorced him from the possibility of getting a farm, and the Commissioners said that his interests were irreconcilable with those of the farmer. The agitation of the past few years had had a most prejudicial effect already. The actual result stated in his evidence by Mr. Morgan Richardson was disastrous to the yeoman farmer:—

> "The difficulties which have been suggested with regard to the Welsh land tenure, and the suggestions which have been made for a land court, have, I may say, prejudiced these freeholders to a very great extent, because the rate of interest has proportionately increased. People have no longer that confidence in investing in land that they had eight or ten years ago. I may say that five or six years ago, before a Welsh land question was heard of, we were frequently offered, personally, by London solicitors, large sums of money at 3 and 3½ per cent. to lend on land in Wales, because the interest was so punctually paid that it was supposed to be a very first-rate investment. But since this agitation has commenced for a Land Court, a great many of those mortgages have been called in, and I find it quite impossible to get the money in again at those same rates."

In the meantime the real grievances of the farmers and their demands were ignored. They were, foreign competition, since 1871, unfair local and Imperial taxation, unfair railway rates, inadequate means of transport, and amendment of the Agricultural Holdings Act. But all those questions were ignored by the Commissioners, and they fell back upon such sententious commonplaces as:—

> "The principal lesson to be learnt from the history of mankind and the observations of society at the present time is that by the application of practical intelligence to the stored-up treasures of knowledge, and by skilful organisations, casualties may be diminished and their results minimised."

[*Laughter.*] A schoolboy would have been flogged for writing such stuff in a theme. [*Laughter.*] They went on:—

> "We represent to your Majesty that the Welsh people are a specially interesting portion of your Majesty's subjects—"

[*Laughter*]; and,

> "please your Majesty they are stout, valiant, courteous, hospitable, temperate, ingenious, capable of all good arts, lovingly constant, charitable, great antiquaries, religious preservers of their gentry and genealogy, as they are zealous and knowing in religion."

[*Laughter.*] Was ever such a Report presented to Parliament? Was ever such a hotch-potch of pedantic irrelevancies composed by "our trusty and well-beloved"? [*Laughter.*]

> "Oh could some sprite the giftie gie 'em
> To see themselves as ithers see 'em."

[*Laughter.*] But it would be of no use. If they were presented with a pier-glass they would only turn their backs. [*Laughter.*] For they belonged to that hopeless family whom Mr. Bunyan describes as "hailing from the town of Stupidity, which lyeth hard by the City of Destruction." [*Laughter and cheers.*]

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said that it was impossible to seriously treat the speech of the hon. Member, but he must repeat the assertion that there had been a greater reduction of rents in England than there had been in Wales. He represented a constituency which had taken a very leading part in the recent development of this question. In Denbighshire a number of the most notable events in connection with this matter had recently taken place. This land question in Wales was not a class question. It was of such vital interest to the country at large that it could be truly said that so far as Wales was concerned it was a national question. It was not until 1880 that there was in the House any adequate representation of the views of the Welsh tenant farmers on the question, and the Royal Commission was the result of the declaration in 1892 by Mr. Gladstone on the Welsh Land Bill that no further steps should be taken until the feeling of Wales and the circumstances of Wales had been officially tested in some way. He laid the greatest stress and importance upon the fact that the unanimous opinion of the Commission was in favour of treating the land question in Wales in a separate Bill. There was no question, therefore, as to whether they should have separate legislation in Wales on the land question. The only question before them was what sort of legislation they should have specially for Wales upon this point. What had led up to the present position as regarded land in Wales? They had first of all historically the cardinal fact that in Wales Welsh nationality had been in conflict with the land-owning class in the country, and then they had the second fact that there had been in Wales two separate land systems which had become practically assimilated; but the tenants still retained a number of ideas belonging to the older system. One further line of cleavage between Welsh landlords and their tenants was that there had been greater friction and greater disagreement owing to religious, political, and social differences. The period since 1850 to 1880 of more or less agricultural prosperity, saw in Wales a spirit of independence grow among the farmers to a greater extent than in England, and that was met by persecution and eviction, and the evictions connected with the election of 1868 would never be forgotten. [*Cheers.*] He asserted without fear of contradiction that from 1880 up to 1896 the depression in Wales had been more acute than in England owing to many circumstances. But these were only the external sympathies of the case. What was the inner history of the question? The Bill promoted two things—security of tenure and fair rent. He did not think it had been pointed out as yet that in reference to the question of security of tenure in

Wales the proportion of occupying tenants to owners of land was much larger than it was in England. The frequent leasing of wealthy estates that had come into considerable prominence during the past few years had added not a little to the sense of insecurity felt by the tenant farmers of Wales in reference to their right to hold their farms. But undoubtedly, as had been pointed out, land hunger was very much felt among the tenant farmers of Wales. The holdings in Wales were smaller than in England, and there was more competition for farms. There were scores, if not hundreds of farmers in Wales who cultivated mountain sides, which it was impossible for them beneficially to cultivate, simply because of the insatiable hunger for land. These facts substantiated the claim embodied in this Bill that the security of land tenure as far as Wales was concerned had a character of its own. Rents in Wales were too high, and ought to be lowered. Reasonable conditions of tenancy on estates owned by certain hon. Members opposite were the exception and not the rule in Wales. This question of land reform in Wales was not only important because agriculture remained the most important industry in the country, but because in Wales they attached special value to rural life. It was from the agricultural classes and from the rural community that in the past the Welsh people had drawn their leaders and teachers, and it was to that class of the community they looked for the mainspring of their national life. He entirely agreed with his hon. Friend in saying that they could not sit down with folded arms and watch the decadence and gradual extinction of this valuable element in their national life without making some honest effort on behalf of the tenant farmers of Wales. He trusted that the principle of the Bill, if not ratified that day, would at no distant time be ratified by a large majority in the House of Commons. [" Hear, hear ! "]

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said that besides having Welsh blood in his veins he possessed a small estate in Wales, chiefly remarkable for the extreme regularity and honesty with which the tenants had paid their rents. The estate had been hundreds of years in his family and never had evictions taken place. He believed this was typical of other estates in Wales. In the Debate they had heard little of the necessity for the Bill, or the peculiarities of it. He believed there was no necessity for the Bill. It was impossible to separate the land question from politics in Wales. He could not think hon. Members were in earnest in producing this Bill. He gave them credit for too much common sense to believe that even in a House composed differently a Bill of that kind would be accepted. It was a reconnaissance in force to ascertain what arguments would be used against the Bill that in the future a Bill framed perhaps more moderately might be brought in. The Mover of the Bill complained that no notice was given of abatements of rent frequently given by Welsh landlords. In that there was no difference between Wales and England. It would be more convenient if notice were given that abatements would continue ten or fifteen years or more, but he could not see that Welsh tenants had any reason to complain if he got the abatement generally given by the landlords in Wales. With regard to the "showers of political evictions" which it was said had prevailed on some estates, he trusted that when the hon. Member considered the matter a little more he would acknowledge that he had drawn the long bow a little too far. He could find no evidence of them. He regretted that the hon. Member abused the new idea of conciliation. No one regretted that it had not been more successful than he did, but he hoped that in future conciliation and voluntary effort would enter more largely into the relations of landlords and tenants in Wales. As to the judges, who it was proposed should have charge of the Land Court, the hon. Member surely could not think that Members on the Government side of the House, or even Welsh landlords, would look without suspicion on a body of men chosen on the recommendation of the Welsh County Councils. The County Councils had done excellent work, and had shown that knowledge of business inherent in every Welshman, but as a landlord he would regard with more than suspicion a body of men whose principal recommendation was that they had been chosen by the Welsh County Councils. It had not been proved that a Bill so drastic as this was required, and that if it was required that this Bill was so drawn as to do justice to both parties. Up to the present time he had not heard that made out or proved, and until it was it would be impossible for him to accept such a Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said the hon. Member who had just spoken had based his conclusion with regard to the land question on his own experience. If the Welsh landlords were all so genial and kindly a type as the last speaker, he had no hesitation in saying that the agitation for land reform would never have gathered sufficient force to justify the bringing in of a Bill of this character. ["Hear, hear!"] But if the hon. Member had perused the evidence given before the Commission, he would have found that that was not the case. The hon. Member had referred to the Report of the minority, but it was a remarkable fact that both the majority and minority Reports agreed that there were very considerable grievances that required redressing in an exceedingly drastic manner. The evidence must have been singularly strong to cause the minority to come to such a conclusion. The only question between the two parties was a question of degree. It was suggested that the Agricultural Holdings Act ought to be amended and a Court of Conciliation set up; but surely that was a very novel departure in the history of agricultural legislation. They had heard a great deal about freedom of contract, but hon. Members opposite proposed to interfere with freedom of contract. The only difference between them was as to the extent to which they were going to interfere with freedom of contract. He was surprised that arguments in favour of freedom of contract had been advanced from the other side of the House, especially after the very sweeping Bill that was passed unanimously yesterday, the first provision of which was that employer and employed should not be allowed to enter into contracts with regard to the question of compensation for injuries except under very restricted conditions. The hon. Member for Radnorshire said that if they interfered with freedom of contract between landlord and tenant they assumed that the landlord was a knave and the tenant a fool; but, on that assumption, the Compensation for Workmen Bill of the Government treated employers as knaves and the employés as fools. He challenged any hon. Member to point to any difference of principle in this respect between the two Bills. Again, the minority Report and the hon. Member for Swansea admitted that there were cases which rendered it necessary to amend the Agricultural Holdings Act. But why did they not trust to freedom of contract in that case? Why was it necessary to amend the Agricultural Holdings Act? Because it was assumed that there were landlords who would deal unfairly with their tenants, when they quitted their holdings would not pay them fair compensation, and confiscate property that belonged to the tenant. What was the difference between that and the position taken up by the promoters of this Bill? The argument of the supporters of the Bill was that there were landlords who dealt as unfairly with their sitting tenants as with their quitting tenants. ["Hear, hear!"] Moreover, the quitting tenant was a perfectly free agent, but the sitting tenant was absolutely in the hands of his landlord and not in a position to enter into a free contract. ["Hear, hear!"] If they were going to interfere with the freedom of contract in one case, on what principle should they refrain from doing so in the other? Hon. Gentlemen opposite said that the quitting tenant must be protected. The promoters of the Bill contended that there was so much rack-renting in Wales that the sitting tenant must also be protected. ["Hear, hear!"] The land hunger in Wales was admitted by both parties, and the minority in the Commission admitted the hard lot of the Welsh tenant. There was a case referred to in the Report of a farm rented at £200. There had been no reduction in the rent, only a remission of 10 per cent. once or twice. The tenant had six children, ranging from 18 to 29, who worked like slaves on the farm. A question was put to the farmer:—"Have you paid them wages for their services?" And he answered, "No; they are not clothed as they should be, and their shoes are worse than their clothes." That seemed to amuse the hon. Member for Shropshire.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON: I assure the hon. Member I did not smile.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I did not refer to the hon. Member. There is another Member for Shropshire.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): My smile had no reference whatever to what the hon. Member was saying. At the moment I was not listening to what he said. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was sorry if he had misunderstood the hon. and gallant Gentleman's smile. The Report was teeming with cases of that kind. The Commissioners admitted the grievance, and all that was now asked was that as a tenant leaving his farm was protected, the tenant remaining on his farm should also be protected. Until that was done there would never be a prosperous state of things in Wales. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR W. HART-DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said that the Mover and Seconder of the Bill had spoken with moderation, but had not advanced a jot or tittle of argument in favour of the merits of the Measure. Those hon. Gentlemen and others had referred to the land hunger in Wales, and had asserted that the fear of losing their holdings poisoned the whole existence of the Welsh farmers. He was sure that his hon. Friends who represented Essex, and other English agricultural counties, would be thankful if some of their tenants were inoculated with such a poison. ["Hear, hear!"] He refused to regard this Measure as simply a Welsh Measure, inasmuch as the bases of the land systems of England and the Principality were identical, and the Bill might with just as much justice be applied to Sussex, Norfolk, and other English counties where different customs prevailed, as to Wales. In the first place the Bill proposed to create dual ownership. That would be a very revolutionary change, but if a similar experiment had not been tried in recent years, something might, in face of the difficulty and danger which now beset agriculture, be said for it. Surely, of all times to choose at which to make such a proposal, this was the very worst. When he introduced his Irish Land Bill of 1870, Mr. Gladstone promised Ireland, as a result of passing that Measure, everlasting peace between landlord and tenant, but in 1881 another Act was passed which produced a state of things so absurd and chaotic that another Land Act was passed last Session, and this year a Commission was to issue, to inquire into the relations between landlord and tenant. In support of the creation of dual ownership in Ireland, two grievances were advanced—the absenteeism of the landlords and the fact that all improvements fell on the tenants. No such grievances could be alleged in the case of Wales—indeed, no charge was made against the existing Welsh landlords. ["Hear, hear!"] If, however, Parliament passed the dual ownership clause, no landlord in Wales would spend a single farthing on the improvement of his property, and the result must necessarily be disadvantageous to the agricultural industry. Then, again, the proposal for the setting up of a Court was so ridiculous that it was really a waste of the time of the House to discuss it. Did hon. Members honestly believe that the Court they were proposing to establish could ever work to the benefit of either landlord or tenant? The proposition was that the County Councils of Wales should furnish the Board of Agriculture with a list of names of gentlemen, and that the Board should choose from the list a certain number of gentlemen who should become agricultural judges, possessing full judicial powers. In view of the mode of selection, could it be imagined for a moment that such a Court would work smoothly or that there would be no legal or political strife? He was reminded that 13 or 14 of the Welsh representatives belonged to the legal profession, and therefore it was not difficult for him to understand the presence of Clause 11 in the Bill. That clause provided that the parties might appear in Court and be represented by Counsel. Under such circumstances, he thought that the Bill might be regarded as a lawyers' relief Bill rather than a tenants' relief Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Another clause provided for fixity of tenure, but his experience as a landlord was that the adverse circumstances of the day had in a sense produced fixity of tenure as regards every good tenant. Any landlord, either in England or Wales, who proposed to get rid of a good tenant, ought to be relegated to the nearest county lunatic asylum. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members opposite had urged again and again that rents had been more largely reduced in England than in Wales during all these bad agricultural seasons. His hon. Friend the Member for Shropshire had shown many cases in which there had been larger reductions in Wales than in England, but, whether that was so or not, he submitted there was a grave distinction between the two cases. For instance, he believed that sheep-farming had paid and did pay at the present moment in Wales, and, also, there was a system of small holdings in Wales which had been largely beneficial to the Welsh tenants throughout this great crisis. So far as this Bill was concerned, revolutionary as it was in its proposals, there was not even the same demand for it, from an economic point of view, in Wales, as there was in England. The hon. Member for Swansea asked for the regulation of the agricultural industry, but, to his mind, Bills of this kind would create such a disastrous state of things between landlord and tenant that they would simply regulate the industry to death. They would upset the whole system of land tenure root and branch. He believed that such a Bill as this would settle nothing as between landlord and tenant or as to the future of agriculture. On the other hand, he believed it would create so much strife as would be a serious injury to every tenant in Wales, and, what was more, to the whole agricultural community both in England and Wales. Therefore, he should vote against the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) said that, as a Member of the Royal Commission on Agricultural Depression, the Welsh evidence given before them seemed to him to fully justify the demand for the present Bill. The right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had, he thought, exaggerated the effect of the Measure. ["Hear, hear!"] He should like to correct the impression he had conveyed to the House, that this Bill created dual ownership in the same way as in Ireland. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had considered the effect of Clause 24, which gave the right of pre-emption to the landlord for purposes of his own. The landlord had, with a year's notice, the right at any time to terminate these judicial tenancies, giving in that case compensation for disturbance to the tenant who was dispossessed. With that condition in the Bill, it was hardly fair to say that they were creating a perpetual judicial tenancy in the same sense which was created in Ireland. He would also like to say that the Minority Report went even further, in certain cases, than the suggestions embodied in the Bill. The Minority, including the hon. Baronet the Member for Swansea, reported that, where an estate owner had died or where there had been a transfer in the ownership of the estate, the tenant should not be open to a notice to quit with one year's notice, but should have a three years' run of his tenancy. That seemed to him a very important recommendation to have been made by the landlord interest upon the Welsh Land Commission. The right hon. Gentleman opposite said this was a Bill to transfer the property of the landlord to the tenant. His opinion, on the contrary, was that it was suggested in order to provide machinery to prevent the appropriation of what the Agricultural Holdings Act had always recognised to be the property of the tenant by the landlord under the present land system. Having carefully considered the Report of the minority as well as of the majority of the Welsh Land Commission, it seemed to him there was very little difference between one point of view, and the suggestions made, and the other as to the class of machinery which was necessary in order to accurately and equitably divide the interests of the landlord from the interests of the tenant, and to protect the interest of the tenant in his improvements and in his tenure from being appropriated. Mr. Pennant, a gentleman of very great ability and experience in these matters, was examined before both the Land Commission and the Agricultural Depression Committee, and he recognised that it was essential to consider the best type of agriculturists—those who threw long-continued work and skill and energy and the accumulated resources of their own into the development of the fertility of the land as contrasted with tenants who farmed from hand to mouth. Mr. Pennant also dwelt on the necessity of creating a new type of agricultural landlord—a man who was of the very highest class of agricultural expert—and his suggestion was that these men should practically be given full power to decide as between the interests of the landlord and tenant in all these matters of improvements, of tenure, of conditions of tenancy, and so on. It seemed to him that when a suggestion of that kind was practically adopted by the Minority representing the landlords on the Welsh Land Commission, it created a very serious and practical situation which the House of Commons ought to take into consideration in dealing with proposals of this kind. This Bill might strike some Members opposite as being a very stringent and very drastic proposal of land tenure reform. All he could say was that the Agricultural Depression Commission had the strongest possible evidence, both from England and Wales, that the position of the best class of tenants, men who ought to be protected by the law of the land in the enjoyment of their improvements, was exceedingly precarious. It seemed to him it was the duty of the House of Commons to provide some adequate machinery, both in the interest of agriculture as well as in the interest of individuals, for protecting the tenant farmer and giving encouragement to the development of work on the land, and the application of capital to the land. His own opinion was that the depression in Wales would have been much less acute than it had been found to be if there had been an adequate and sufficiently prompt reduction of rent in proportion to the fall in prices. It seemed to him that in Wales and in Scotland the conditions of agricultural depression had been greatly aggravated by the fact that there had been keen competition for land, and rents had been kept up owing to competition being taken as the measure of value—kept up to such a point as to gradually sweep all possible profits out of the pockets of the tenants into the pockets of the landlords, so that in addition to the depression arising from natural causes the tenants had suffered from a form of depression that was largely due to the persistent high renting of their farms.

*MR. W. T. HOWELL (Denbigh Boroughs) said that, as representing a Welsh constituency, he felt that he ought to say in a few words why he opposed the Bill. He regarded it as a more revolutionary measure than any which hon. Members on the opposite side had hitherto brought before the House. It tended to deprive the landlord of the control of his property, and to interfere with freedom of contract. When a revolutionary Bill like that was brought forward, which struck away the essential basis of the land system in Wales, the House was entitled to ask for convincing arguments, for strong facts, and for conclusive figures, before it allowed such a drastic Measure to be passed. He must confess that he had listened to the Debate, and he had sought in declarations made outside the House, but he had failed to find anything like convincing arguments, strong facts, or conclusive figures that would show a reasonable man bringing his judgment to bear on the condition of agriculture in Wales that any existing grievances or difficulties were going to be remedied, and could only be remedied, by a Land Court. The hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs had challenged them on the Government side of the House to show where the distinction was between the Bill which passed through the House last evening to that now submitted to it. He took up the challenge with cheerfulness. Where was the parallel between the two Measures? It was about the most absurd parallel he had ever heard brought forward in argument. In the case of the injured workman they had already got a liability upon the employer; the workman had been injured, there was the liability to pay, and conciliation was only applied to fix the amount. The employer was already bound to pay something, but the landlord was not bound to let his land. Had the Government brought forward a Bill to settle the rates of wages, there would have been some parallel; but there was no parallel between the Workmen's Compensation Bill and the Bill they were now discussing. ["Hear, hear!"] Passing to the grounds upon which it was suggested that this Bill ought to become law, the first thing that struck him was the emphasis laid on the fact that there was a land hunger in Wales. He was ready to admit, for the sake of argument, that there was a land hunger in Wales. ["Hear, hear!"] But the extraordinary part of it was that this Bill as framed would in no way affect that land hunger. And for this reason. The land hunger was supposed to be the cause of the competition for holdings. Under the Bill a tenant might still make a voluntary agreement with the landlord, and they could take that into Court and make it an order of the Court. Gentlemen opposite would see at once that what would happen if this land hunger existed was this. The tenant who wished to get a certain holding would induce the landlord to select him by offering an excessive rent. If that was so, this Bill would not, at any rate, deal with the land hunger. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Members opposite had made a great deal of the fact that the majority of the Welsh Land Commission reported in favour of a Land Court. But that did not carry much weight, at any rate, in the Principality itself, because for some reason—possibly because the political tendencies of the majority were known before ever they set foot in Wales—it was felt that the constitution of the Commission was such that, in all probability, a Land Court would be the result. Hon. Members opposite must know that was the fact, that the general expectation in Wales was that the Commission would recommend the establishment of a Land Court. Further than that, the procedure of some of the members of the Commission showed that they had in their minds the idea of a Land Court before they had inquired into the opinions of the tenants. He would prove this by quoting part of the examination of a witness by the Chairman of that Commission, showing that the Chairman had the idea of a Land Court in his mind and was leading the witness into acquiescing, not only in a Land Court, but in a Land Court of exactly the kind the Chairman had conceived in his own mind. The witness was a retired master mariner who had left the sea and taken to farming. He was a witness in favour of a Land Court, and this was how his evidence was elicited, as it never could have been elicited in a Court of Law. The Chairman said:—

> "You told us you wished for a Land Court. Now is it for this reason? Would you like to see a Land Court established that you could refer to if you thought your rent higher than it ought to be, and the landlord thought it was a fair rent? Is that what you mean?"

The witness said "Yes." Then the Chairman:—

> "A sort of Court that you could refer to of practical men who would decide, and whose decision would be final and legal, as to what rent you were to pay?"

The witness, "Yes." The Chairman:—

> "As for fixity of tenure, I suppose you mean that so long as you paid that rent and farmed in a husbandlike manner, you should be secured in your holding and able to live on that holding so long as you carried out the conditions imposed on you by the Court?"

The witness, "Yes." The House would notice how the Chairman had suggested all the essentials of a Land Court to the witness, and the witness was simply acquiescing in the description of Land Court the Chairman had conceived in his own mind. [Replying to an hon. Member below the Gangway, Mr. HOWELL said the name of the witness was Captain Badcock, and the number of the question at which he began was 3,764.] The Chairman, he continued, was not satisfied still; he had not got quite enough evidence out of his acquiescing witness, and he went on to ask another question:—

> "And besides that you wish the Court to adjudicate on any losses from game or losses from timber-felling that you might be subject to, and that the landlord might decline to pay. You would refer those sort of questions to the Land Court as well?"

The witness replied, "Yes, my Lord." He had taken the trouble to find out how much the Chairman had spoken, and how much the witness spoke—this witness who was asking for the Land Court described. Altogether the witness spoke six words to 188 words from the Chairman. [*Laughter.*] Four times the witness said "Yes," and once he said "My Lord." [*Laughter.*]

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, in that case, the proof of the witness had not been handed to the Chairman? ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. HOWELL: I am not aware one way or the other. It may be so, but I am taking the evidence as it is printed and published for the information of this House. What may have happened before the Commission I do not know; but here we have the evidence as it is given, and extracted from the witness by a series of leading questions. At any rate, that is the form on which the evidence is given in the Report, and I must leave the explanation to hon. Gentlemen opposite. Continuing, he said they had heard much about the excess of rents in Wales; but if hon. Members would take the trouble to read the Report—a great volume of hundreds of pages—they would see how timid the Commissioners were in bringing any allegation of excessive rents against the Welsh landlords, and they would see that the case for excessive rents which had been made outside the House was not a fair representation of the condition of things in Wales. He would read an extract from the Report of the Commission, on page 898. What the Commissioners were bold enough to say about excessive rents was this:—

> "The majority of landlords do not, according to their own view, demand higher than fair rent."

Those were the Commissioners' own words. And what said a witness who had as much weight with the Commission as any witness before them—Major Birch, a land agent of the county of Denbigh. Now, Major Birch happened to be a land agent in England as well as in Wales, and he thought the members of the Commission would say he gave his evidence in a perfectly fair and straightforward manner. What did he say? Comparing his experience in England and Wales, he said that—

> "rents in Wales were lower than in England, and that more was done for the tenant in Wales than was done in England."

That was Major Birch's comparison of the condition of things as between England and Wales. He must suggest to the House that this was a very serious matter for Wales, because they were going to have a Court set up to stand between landlord and tenant with a Judge who was bound by no sort of law whatever. The Judges of the Courts at present had to administer the law; they were bound by it, and if they went outside it their decisions could be appealed from and upset. It seemed absurd to put these men on the same footing, and clothe them as Judges. They were, as he had said, bound by no law, but were to be local dictators in the matter of the land. Their functions would not be judicial, but more those of a witness in an ordinary action. To call such men Judges was an abuse of the term. These Judges were going to fix fair rents without any suggestion of what kind of principle they were to act upon, and without the slightest restraint put upon them. And who were going to appoint these men? They were to be appointed by the County Councils. It was perfectly well known that in a large number of the present County Councils in Wales the tenant farmers had a majority of the Councillors; so that it was the farmer who was going to draw up the list of the Judges who were going to sit over him in connection with agricultural matters, and all the Board of Agriculture could do would be to choose between A, B, C, and D. It was said that the effect of these Courts would not be so bad as the effect in Ireland, because they were going to prohibit free sale. But they were going to allow a man to get such a tenant right as he could devolve by will to his children. Once having found that their tenant right was worth money, how long did they think the farmers would be content? They would say they were allowed to dispose of their property by will, and would come forward and say if it was their property it was unjust they should not have the right to sell it, and immediately a section of hon. Members on the other side of the House would be found to support them in that claim. If the Land Courts were established, they would immediately have an agitation for the right of the tenant to free sale, and have all those ills which had resulted from the free sale of tenant right in Ireland. It seemed to him that this was a particularly inopportune time for Gentlemen opposite to suggest the establishment of a Welsh Land Court, this being the very moment when both sides were condemning the Courts established in Ireland under the Land Act of 1881. He could only think hon. Members opposite, in bringing the matter forward at the present time, were rather of the description of reformers spoken of by the Colonial Secretary the other night, namely, the reformers who wished to punish. These reformers wished to punish the landlords of Wales who came with flying colours out of the great test put to them by the Land Commission. And why? Simply and solely because they happened to be capitalists with their capital invested in land.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomery) observed that, as a resident landlord in Wales, he could claim to have a somewhat better acquaintance with the subject of the Bill than most hon. Members opposite, with the exception of the hon. Member for Swansea Boroughs. He thought it was typical of this discussion and illustrative of the reasons which called for it, that of the two Motions for the rejection of the Bill, one had been moved by an hon. Member who was a recent immigrant into Wales, and the other by the hon. Member for Tunbridge, who was an emigrant from Wales, and had gone, as far as geographical circumstances would admit, to find a constituency away from Wales. He supported the Bill from the point of view of one who wished to raise the social condition of the tenants. Nothing had struck him more painfully during his acquaintance with Wales than the condition of subjection and social inferiority in which the tenants felt themselves. He agreed with hon. Members who objected to interference with freedom of contract so far as this, that he thought anybody who proposed to interfere with freedom of contract was bound to justify that course. He submitted to the House that the conditions which required an interference with freedom of contract existed in Wales to an extent that did not exist in England. Taking poverty, 80 per cent. of the occupiers in Wales had holdings above five and under 200 acres. Assuming, therefore, that 15s. an acre was the average rent, and that the rule held good that the tenant's income equalled the rent (both favourable assumptions for his opponents), it followed that the bulk of the tenants had at the outside only £3 per week to live upon, which was not more than the wages of a prosperous artisan in their great towns. The farms were not being cultivated by capitalist farmers, but by actual working farmers, who kept few servants, and worked along with their sons and labourers. Take the question of language. It was shown by the census that upwards of 500,000 of the Welsh population spoke Welsh exclusively, and that above 500,000 were bi-lingual. Even of those who were bi-lingual, their knowledge of English was so imperfect that they would find very great difficulty indeed in making themselves understood and in transacting business with English people. Consequently a large proportion of the people of Wales, who had no industry but farming, could only earn their living in a district where the Welsh language was spoken, and were precluded from migrating into England or the English-speaking parts of Wales. The result of these factors had been the keen competition for land which was called by the Commissioners land hunger. He did not like the phrase land hunger, and he should prefer terming it the pressure of the population upon the means of subsistence. There was an agricultural population in Wales which, partly in consequence of poverty, and partly in consequence of speaking but the one language, was compelled to work for its living in one restricted area, and the result of that was a keen competition throughout that area. It was impossible that that state of things could exist without undue competition, necessitating some amount of interference. Under these circumstances, the demand for some external authority, which should regulate the relations between landlord and tenant, seemed to him, not only natural on the part of the tenants, but desirable in the interests of the land-owners themselves. He thought a fair test of a Bill of this kind was whether it carried into effect what would be the conditions of a fair agreement between landlord and tenant. Everybody knew that the ordinary English tenancy from year to year, strictly interpreted according to English law, was an absolutely impossible tenure. He thought it was Lord Dufferin who said of it years ago, when dealing with the Irish agitation, that it was a tenure which no Christian man would offer, and no sane man would accept. The only reason why the tenure from year to year had lasted so long as it had, was that it had been modified by custom, and this had in many cases worked fairly well, especially on large estates. But when an estate changed hands, or when they had a landowner who was in pecuniary embarrassment or a despotic character, the custom broke down, the tenure became impossible, and it was then the duty of the Legislature to clothe moral obligations, which had always been recognised, with legal sanction. Recent events in North Wales had shown that this was not an imaginary need. The House would not forget that Lord Penrhyn, besides being a great quarry owner, was also a great landowner. Who would guarantee the Penrhyn tenantry from being treated like the Penrhyn quarrymen if Lord Penrhyn should think his duty required him to do so. The Bill provided for arbitration between landlord and tenant, for the purpose of deciding what rent should be paid by the latter. That principle had been accepted by the minority of the Commissioners. It was scarcely fair, however, to talk about a majority or minority Report in connection with this Commission, because the Report was almost an unanimous one, there being a difference of opinion upon one single point only, namely, whether rent should be settled by arbitration or by conciliation. The nature of the tribunal which it was proposed to constitute had been criticised by hon. Members opposite; but this surely was a question that could be dealt with in Committee. Amendments to the Bill on this point would receive fair consideration. Landowners should note that no difficulty would be placed in the way of their resuming a farm, or part of a farm, when such resumption was desirable in the interests of the community. The provision that the right to a tenancy should descend to a tenant's representatives would simply legalise the practice already prevailing on almost every estate in Wales, and he did not see any reason why this preference should not be given to a tenant's representatives by a legal enactment when it existed already as a matter of fact. They had been told that it would be impossible to fix rents, because there would be no market to establish a standard, but those who took that objection did not take into account the present procedure of valuation. Everybody knew that when a farm was valued a careful estimate was made of the producing power of the land on the one side, and on the other side an estimate was made of the outgoings, including interest on the tenant's capital, his wages of superintendence, and all other expenses. There was every reason to believe that any tribunal that might be set up would take that course in the future, and as the prices of farm produce and the remuneration of bailiffs and farm servants were regulated by the fluctuations of the market, the objection to which he was referring could not be entertained. He knew that the Bill was going to be rejected, but he doubted greatly whether hon. Members were wise in giving a blank refusal to the request of the Welsh Liberal Members. Was it to the interest of the Welsh landlords themselves that they should take up an irreconcilable attitude on this question? He held not, and he thought that they were resting on a broken reed. Let the Welsh landowners who were relying upon the support of the Unionist Party remember what had befallen the Irish landlords. To-day the Irish landlords were almost leading the revolt against the English system of Government because they believed that they had been abandoned by those to whom they had hitherto looked for support. He represented a great agricultural county, and was well acquainted with the views of the Welsh farmers and traders. He knew that they still entertained a warm regard for the great Welsh families, and it would be very difficult to extinguish this feeling in the hearts of the Welsh people; but it would be possible to do so, and an uncompromising rejection of their just demands would be more likely than anything else to effect a change in their present sentiments. He therefore warned the Welsh landlords to be wise in time, and asked them to allow this Bill to pass. He recognised that some of their criticisms were justified, and reminded them that in Committee they would have opportunities of amending the Measure.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby) said that it would not be necessary or possible for him at that hour to trespass very long upon the attention of the House. Hon. Members opposite might have found it difficult to follow the good advice given to them recently by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the South-east Division of Essex as to the length of speeches, but the time at his disposal would oblige him to follow that advice. The hon. Member who had just sat down had appealed to those who opposed this Bill to come to terms with the supporters of the Measure in order that the Welsh landlords might avoid the unhappy fate which had overtaken the Irish landlords. Some very remarkable arguments had been advanced in support of the Second Reading of this Bill, but it had been left to the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire to advance the most extraordinary one of all. Did the hon. Member not know that the cause which underlay the whole of the difficulty in Ireland, and which had brought trouble and loss to the landlords without contenting the tenants, was the change made in the law in regard to Irish land in 1881? ["Hear, hear!"] Anyone who attempted now to deal with the Irish land question found that the difficulties in the way had been immensely increased by the departure taken in 1881. Yet those were the circumstances to which the hon. Member pointed to-day to induce the Welsh landlords to come to terms with the promoters of this Bill.

*MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN explained that his object in referring to Ireland was merely to point out that the Welsh landlords might be deserted hereafter by the Unionist Party, and that it might therefore be to their advantage to come to terms now.

*MR. LONG failed to see why the hon. Member had interrupted him, unless it was for the purpose of adding a postscript to his speech. He ventured to think that the hon. Member had not improved his position by his interruption. The Bill before them had been recommended to the House on two grounds, the first being that Wales occupied a distinct position. They had been told of the land hunger in Wales and of a Welsh-speaking race who could earn a living nowhere except in their own country, and who were naturally disinclined to leave it. The speeches of the Mover and Seconder of the Bill had been couched in terms of great courtesy and fairness, and he took note with satisfaction of this alteration in the tone of hon. Members opposite who advocated the cause of the tenants as against the Welsh landlords. The case against the landlords had not always been put so moderately and fairly. He hoped, therefore, that it was the intention of hon. Members opposite and of their friends in the country, who supported the cause of extreme land reform, to cease making attacks upon the Welsh landlords as a class, and that the House had heard the last of accusations for which there was no justification in the evidence given before the Royal Commission. ["Hear, hear!"] If the value of the labours of the Commission was to be judged by the length of its Report, its value must be great indeed, for the Report covered nearly a thousand pages. He admitted that there was a great deal in it that was very interesting. He did not pretend to have read the whole of it, but he had read a great deal, and he hoped to read it all in time. [*Laughter.*] The Report was certainly instructive, if regarded as a general history of Wales and its people. But he had not found that assistance which he expected to find in the Report of the Commission, which he understood was specially appointed to inquire into the land question in Wales. That report, he supposed, was to be taken as the foundation of this Bill. The supporters of the Measure urged that the case of Wales was so different from the case of England that separate treatment was necessary. It had been alleged that the report of the minority justified the contention that separate legislation was necessary for Wales. He declined to accept that description of the minority Report. His hon. Friend the Member for Swansea and those who thought with him had stated that any alteration which might be deemed to be necessary could be and ought to be effected by an Amendment in the Agricultural Holdings Act, and they only advocated separate legislation for Wales in the absence of a general Measure of that nature such as had been promised for England and Wales. There was, moreover, a fallacy underlying this proposition of separate treatment, because it was very well known that hon. Members who had supported this Bill would be just as ready to aid a similar Bill for England. A proportion of the people in Wales it was true spoke only the Welsh language. That, no doubt, was an obstacle in the way of their going from home and seeking a livelihood; but no argument had been advanced, either as to the competition for farms in the pastoral districts, love of home, or a desire to remain in their districts, which supported the Welsh claim and which did not find an echo among Englishmen who were conversant with similar facts in relation to England. While hon. Gentlemen from Wales had been eloquent as to the sufferings of the Welsh tenant, and had told the House a great deal about the undue renting of Welsh agriculturists and their difficulties, they had not said a word why it was that they believed this proposal of theirs was going to prove a sovereign remedy for Welsh difficulties. A great deal had been said as to the position of agriculturists in Ireland, where legislation of this kind had existed for many years; but it had been shown in evidence that though the Irish Land Courts fixed fair rents the decrease of rent in Ireland had not been so great under the system of Land Court reduction as it had been in England through the voluntary action of the landlord. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen ignored the fact that what was wanted was to improve the condition of the agricultural tenant, in order to make him better able to compete with his difficulties. It was admitted in the Report of the Commission that there was no real cause of complaint in Wales on the score of absenteeism, lack of equipment of farms, or unreadiness on the part of the landlords to provide the necessary buildings. Did hon. Members believe that they could take away from the landlord all right of dealing with his property and his tenant while at the same time expect the landlord to continue the work he had been carrying out for years in connection with his property?

He was convinced that if they wanted to benefit the tenant farmer the end would not be attained by introducing this outside system and by bringing in a third party in connection with the fixing of a fair rent. The present system of land tenure was not only ancient, but it had conferred great benefits on society and on agriculture, and the charges brought against the system were very few indeed. It had, on the whole, worked fairly as between class and class; under it this country had attained a position in connection with agriculture and its processes which no other country in the world had reached. The House ought not, therefore, in a moment, and without greater reason and justification being shown than were contained in the speeches of the supporters of the Bill or in the Report, to interfere with so ancient a system of land tenure. As the representative of the Government he asked the House to reject the Bill in such a way as to show how decided its opinion was. [*Cheers.*]

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 154; Noes, 278.—(Division List—No. 210—appended.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Rt. Hon. A H. Dyke
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allen, Wm. (Newc.-under-Lyme
Allison, Robert Andrew
Ambrose, Robert (Mayo, W.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.)
Clough, Walter Owen
Colville, John
Commins, Andrew
Cozens-Hardy, Herbert Hardy
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Daly, James
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, W. Rees- (Pembrokesh.)
Davitt, Michael
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, Thos. Edw. (Merionethsh.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton)
Evershed, Sydney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Matthew (Durham)
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Harrison, Charles
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas, Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Holburn, J. G.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Edw.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Leuty, Thomas Richmond
Lloyd-George, David
Lockwood, Sir Frank (York)
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
McArthur, William
M'Hugh, E. (Armagh, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
McKenna, Reginald
McLaren, Charles Benjamin
Maden, John Henry
Mandeville, J. Francis
Mellor, Rt. Hn. J.W. (Yorks.)
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel)
Morgan, Rt. Hn. Sir G. O. (Denbs.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)
Morton, Edw. John Chalmers
Mundella, Rt. Hn. Anthony John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
Owen, Thomas
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pinkerton, John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Randell, David
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roche, Hn. James (East Kerry)
Roche, John (East Galway)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Charles Prestwich
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert (Perth)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wayman, Thomas
Wedderburn, Sir William
Weir, James Galloway
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Fredk. W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodall, William
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Mr. Brynmor Jones and Mr. Herbert Roberts.

NOES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold, Alfred
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ascroft, Robert
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baden-Powell, Sir Geo. Smyth
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, A. H. Smith- (Hunts.)
Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants.)
Beckett, Ernest William
Begg, Ferdinand Faithful
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, M. M.
Biddulph, Michael
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolitho, Thomas Bedford
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Bucknill, Thomas Townsend
Bullard, Sir Harry
Carson, Edward
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Lord Hugh
Chaloner, Captain R. G. W.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clarke, Sir Edw. (Plymouth)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne (Beds.)
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.
Cox, Robert
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Currie, Sir Donald
Curzon, Rt. Hn. G. N. (Lanc. S. W
Curzon, Viscount (Bucks.)
Dalbiac, Major Philip Hugh
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dane, Richard M.
Davies, Horatio D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. Dixon
Donkin, Richard Sim
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Doxford, William Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Duncombe, Hn. Hubert V.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Gen. Sir James Bevan
Fardell, Thomas George
Farquhar, Sir Horace
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Fielden, Thomas
Finch, George H.
Finch-Hatton, Hon. Harold H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir R. U. Penrose
FitzWygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forwood, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur B.
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fry, Lewis
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gilliat, John Saunders
Godson, Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. G'rg's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Captain
Gunter, Colonel
Hall, Sir Charles
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Havelock-Allan, General Sir H.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down)
Hill, Rt. Hn. A. Staveley (Staffs.)
Hill, Sir Edw. Stock (Bristol)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Samuel (Norwich)
Hopkinson, Alfred
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, James Henry Cecil
Hubbard, Hon. Evelyn
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutchinson, Capt. G. W. Grice-
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, John H. (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenny, William
Kenrick, William
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Edwin (Cornwall)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverp'l.)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, William Edward H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swans'a)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R. (Essex)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverpool)
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lorne, Marquess of
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lubbock, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclean, James Mackenzie
Maclure, John William
McCalmont, Gen. (Antrim, N.)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis

McKillop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Ed. Wm. J.
Marks, Henry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Sir Herbert E.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milbank, Powlett Charles John
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Sir Frederick George
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robert Jasper
Morgan, Hn. Frd.(Monmthsh.)
Morrison, Walter
Mowbray, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Northcote,Hon. Sir H. Stafford
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Pease, Arthur (Darlington)
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Capt. Ernest George
Priestley,SirW.Overend(Edin.)
Pryce-Jones, Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Thomas
Ridley, Rt. Hn.Sir MatthewW.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Baron F. James de
Russell,Gen. F.S. Cheltenham)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Col. Edw. James
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel (Herts)
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stewart,Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sutherland, Sir Thomas
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, John G. (Oxford Univ.)
Thorburn, Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Usborne, Thomas
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Waring, Col. Thomas
Warkworth, Lord
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webster,SirR.E.(Isle of Wight)
Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.
Wharton, John Lloyd
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whiteley,H. (Ashton-under-L.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worc'sh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Edmond R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Second Reading put off for six months.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 2nd June.

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

LAW OF LIBEL AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

CEMETERIES RATING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY (FOREIGN SHIPOWNERS) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

COMMONS (REGULATION) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1894) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 2nd June.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

POLICE PENSIONS AND SERVICE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

COLONIAL SOLICITORS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

ESTATES TAIL BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 18th June.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 2,—

Committee report progress; to sit again To-morrow.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Friday.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Friday.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1,—

Commitee report progress; to sit again To-morrow.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MOTION.

MARRIED WOMEN (IRELAND).

Bill to amend the law relating to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates in reference to married women in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Maurice Healy and Mr. Dane; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 261.]

GOVERNMENT OFFICES (APPROPRIATION OF SITES), 1896.

Ordered, That the Report and Evidence of the Select Committee on Government Offices (Appropriation of Sites), 1896, be referred to the Select Committee on Government Offices (Appropriation of Sites).—*(Mr. Akers-Douglas.)*

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes before Six o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 20th May 1897.

PROVISIONAL ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill,

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH said he did not rise for the purpose of moving a hostile amendment, or to ask their Lordships to reject the Bill. He was deterred from taking this step not so much on account of the intrinsic value of the Bill, the acceptance which it was likely to meet with in Scotland, or the relief it was likely to afford to Private Bill procedure in Scotland, as from a recognition that the principles on which the measure was based were good and useful and should receive the assent of their Lordships. This Bill was one of a type too familiar of recent years—namely, a Bill founded on excellent principles which were generally accepted in the country, but often only recently adopted by supporters of the Government and agreeable to those who sat on his side of the House; and when the time came to translate these principles into a Bill they found that the work was undertaken in a timid and hesitating manner. The provisions of the Bill were so hedged in by checks and safeguards, the whole subject was so 'cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd,' that but little benefit was to be obtained from the principles, nor was any additional freedom conferred on those whom it was intended to benefit. He thought that Scotland had some reason to complain of the attention given by the Government to Scottish legislation. Members of the Government were very fond of pointing out the advance which their opinions had made in Scotland, but so far the Government had not been very ready to recognise that opinion in the shape of legislative coin. Last year Scotland got nothing; this year it had received the promise of a Bill dealing with Private Bill legislation; and he supposed Scotland had to accept this Bill as representing the fulfilment of that promise. He could hardly believe that when the paragraph on this point was inserted in the Queen's Speech this Bill was drafted, or was even in the minds of Ministers, because ths measure did not attempt to deal with Private Bill legislation affecting Scotland as a whole; it merely nibbled one corner of the subject. He thought that the Secretary for Scotland had shown no small amount of self-confidence in the basis he had taken for the Bill. In 1888 a strong and important Joint Committee of the two Houses sat on this subject, and after hearing much evidence and giving the subject careful consideration they agreed to a report. That report had been put aside altogether. His noble Friend had founded his Bill on a draft report presented to the Committee by himself, though he admitted that his noble Friend had the assent of three other colleagues on the Committee, Lord Colville, Sir Joseph Pease, and Lord Stalbridge. These Gentleman were well acquainted with the necessities of Private Bill legislation, but he thought that they looked at the subject rather from one point of view. They were closely connected with the greater Railway corporations, and it was known that the great Railway Companies had always considered that it was to their advantage to have all private Bills considered in London by Committees of the two Houses. They had always set themselves against any attempt to deal with these matters locally and by means of local bodies. That being the case he thought that his noble Friend should have shown a little suspicion of his supporters on the Committee. He would have done well to pay more attention to the report agreed to by the Committee rather than to have adopted the report presented by the chairman and set aside. He thought that the limited character of the Bill was well shown by its title. It was not even called a bill for dealing with Private Bill legislation. If he understood the use of a Provisional Order aright it was to allow a municipality or corporation through a Department the right to make use of the powers of an existing public Act. That seemed to him to be a very different thing from the requirements of a Private Bill which gave to a municipality or corporation powers which might be entirely novel and which were certainly not necessarily contained in any existing Act. In order to commend this new procedure to the House his noble Friend should have given a greater proof of the gain to be obtained from this Bill. He should have shown more clearly that the procedure would be more simple and less expensive The noble Lord gave no details as to the probable expense of the procedure. He should have shown also that it really would have done something effectual to relieve Members of Parliament from the burdens which at present were put upon them. In looking at the different stages which a Provisional Order or Private Bill would have to pass through he said that first of all notices would have to be given to all parties affected. Those preliminary proceedings were some of the most expensive parts of a Private Bill. Take the Glasgow Improvements Bill recently in the House of Commons. That was a Bill proposing to give the Glasgow Corporation power to deal with certain slums. It necessitated an enormous number of notices to owners and occupiers, even down to monthly tenants. These notices under an Order of the Court of Session regulating fees cost nine shillings each, and the total amount paid by the Glasgow Corporation for these notices alone was close on £1,000. One object of a Bill dealing with Private Bill legislation should be to try to cheapen its preliminary proceedings; and in this case notices might very easily have been sent out by post in registered letters to each individual at a cost of a few pence. He was told with regard to Sewerage, Gas, and Tramways Bills, similar notices were required to be given to all within a radius of 300 yards of the place where the gas works, tramway station, or sewerage place was to be erected, at a cost, also fixed by the Court of Session, of six shillings each. Thus they might have expected to find in this Bill that some process had been adopted of cheapening the preliminary stages in connection with matters only dealt with by Private Bills. Then copies of the Provisional Order had to be served out to all the Departments and laid before both Houses of Parliament. The Chairmen of Committees in both Houses next decided whether the subject was one which ought fairly to be dealt with in this Bill, or whether it should not be dealt with by Private Bill, under the old system. He imagined that this would involve the payment of certain fees to the two Houses. The next stage was that any opponent might claim to show cause before the tribunal composed of the two Chairmen of Committees and the Secretary for Scotland why the Question should not be dealt with under this Bill as a Private Bill. The opponents he imagined, would be entitled to appear before that tribunal by counsel. They would be able to bring their witnesses, and to take full advantage of that stage to show why the old system of procedure should be adopted rather than the new. The proposal having passed through this sifting process, then the Bill again came before the Secretary for Scotland, and he had the power either to refuse the proposal altogether, or he might direct an inquiry as to the propriety of assenting to the prayer of the Commission. That particular provision introduced a new stage in an unopposed Measure, because, as he read the clause, the Secretary for Scotland had no choice whatever except to refuse to allow the order to proceed or send it before the Commissioners for local inquiry. After the local inquiry had taken place, again the Order was reported to the Secretary for Scotland. Again he had the power of refusing it absolutely He had the power of confirming it, or confirming it with alterations, as might seem right to him, and then again, the Order, if so altered, had to be again lodged in all the departments, had again to be sent round to all people interested, and more time and expense in that way must necessarily be involved. After the Bill had received the Secretary for Scotland's sanction, any opponent might again come in. He might claim that instead of the Order receiving the sanction of the Secretary for Scotland by his mere fiat, there should be a confirming Bill in the Houses of Parliament. If that request were made the Secretary for Scotland was bound to introduce a confirming Bill in Parliament, and that Bill had to be referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament. Before that Joint Committee the whole procedure now in force before Private Bill Committees came into play. In all this he failed to see that there would be much saving in time or money, or any gain in simplicity of procedure, nor any great saving of labour to Members of Parliament as regards attendance on Committees. And for this reason, that they submitted the proposals under this

Bill to a searching sifting in the earlier stages, a sifting that would cause most of the more important proposals to be treated as Private Bills and referred to select Committees of Parliament in the same way as at present. Again, would it be possible under this Bill to deal with a number of subjects in one Order, as in the case of an omnibus Bill? His noble Friend had shown ingenuity in setting up a kind of Committee of Selection, which was to select the panel from which Commissioners were to be chosen for local inquiries. If his noble Friend should succeed in finding a Committee of Selection which would have the same recognised authority as the Committee of Selection in the other House of Parliament he would deserve congratulations on his achievement, and he should be glad to help him in attaining it. He entered, however, a word of protest as to including a Sheriff or Judge on the Commissions. His own belief was that they should keep the legal element out of these Commissions altogether. They should be composed of men of affairs, and the nearer they could bring the local committee to the present constitution of Committees of Parliament the better would it be and the greater assent would there be to their decisions. He was sorry his noble Friend had not thought of a better way of obtaining the opinion of the burghs. The convention of Royal Burghs was theoretically an admirable body no doubt, but its views by no means commanded the assent of the whole of the burghs of Scotland, and, indeed, practically it had largely fallen into the hands of what he might call a clique. The fault he had to find with regard to the whole of the four members who were to act as a Committee of Selection—two being selected by conveners of counties and two by the Convention of Royal Burghs—was that all fonr would almost certainly belong to the Conservative Party. If they had such a Committee of Selection chosen entirely from one Party its decisions would not command the assent of the people of Scotland. Whether they chose rightly or wrongly it would be liable to criticism which would weaken the authority of the panel it would have to choose. What was to be the life of the Committee of Selection?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR): Sub-section (*d*) of Section 4 is intended to cover that point. It is to be re-convened at the end of five years.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH thought the point was not made clear. So far as appeared from the section the same four men chosen when the Act came into operation might go on to the end of all time. There had been no time since the Bill was introduced to gather any real expression of Scotch opinion with regard to it. He had endeavoured to do so, and as far as he had gathered it the general opinion of all parties was that the Bill was not sufficient, and would not satisfy the natural desires of the people of Scotland. He therefore appealed to the Secretary for Scotland to give up all idea of passing the Bill this Session. Let it be discussed and referred to a Select Committee, and after that go through its further stages; let the Bill as so amended remain before the country during the autumn, and then the House would be in a better position to deal with the subject next year. He could assure his noble Friend that he should be only too glad in a reasonable manner to give him all such assistance as he could desire, in obtaining a thoroughly good Measure for the reform of Scotch Private Bill procedure.

*THE EARL OF MORLEY (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said that he wished to acknowledge the courtesy of the noble Lord in showing him the Bill some time ago, together with the criticisms which he had received with reference to it. He could assure the noble Lord that any remarks which he might make upon the Bill, would be made in no unfriendly spirit. Of course the present system of Private Bill legislation was not ideally perfect. There were complaints, not only that it consumed too much of the time of Parliament—this did not apply to this House so much as to the House of Commons, though he found no burning desire on the part of the noble Lords to take part on Private Bill Committees; but also, and this was more important, as to the expense, delay, and inconvenience which was caused to promoters and opponents. In addition, with respect to Ireland and Scotland, there was the sentimental desire of the inhabitants of those countries to have their Private Bill legislation localised. He was strongly of opinion that with regard to Private Bill legislation generally, there were reforms which might considerably simplify and cheapen the procedure. He argued that it was very desirable, if possible, to shorten and cheapen the process of advertising and serving notices; but no noble Lord would desire that any person's property should be affected without due notice. ["Hear, hear!"] Then he believed that the system of Provisional Orders might be further extended with advantage. At present that system had been decidedly successful; but of course it covered only a small portion of ground of private legislation. He was very much struck with the increase of the application by small municipalities to Parliament for legislation. He would suggest to those who were responsible for the Local Government and Home Office administration, that some alteration and extension of the present Public Health Acts might render it absolutely unnecessary for many of these costly applications to be made. ["Hear, hear!"] As to the Bill itself, he looked upon it as a step in the direction of increasing the scope and field for Provisional Orders, and he should not be doing his duty if he did not explain to the House, what he thought the result of the Bill would be —and its scope was much wider than Lord Tweedmouth seemed to suppose. He should also suggest certain amendments, as at a later stage he would not be able to address the House. The normal system contemplated by the Bill was that Scotch Private Bills would be dealt with generally by the Secretary for Scotland and the Commission of Inquiry. There would be notices, and there was nothing in the Bill to prevent the Secretary for Scotland and his coadjutors from making such regulations as they thought fit for the issue of such notices. There would be Standing Orders which would have to be complied with, and an examiner to certify that they had been complied with. The Order would go through the local inquiry and then, if approved by the Secretary for Scotland, it became law and had the force of a statute. The only contact which these Orders in the normal state would have with Parliament was at two stages of their existence—at the tme of their birth and at the time that they assumed almost their final form, when they would be deposited in the Private Bill Offices. Bills not dealt with in this simple way would be brought before Parliament under two conditions. The first condition was when the Secretary of State and the Chairman of Committees of the two Houses should be of opinion that the Order ought to come before Parliament as an ordinary Private Bill; but in the first place an appeal to that effect should have been lodged by the promoters or by the opponents. He did not imagine that the hearings of these appeals would be expensive. The question would be decided by the Secretary for Scotland and the two Chairmen on reading the Bill, and any documents which they might call. Then again, before the Order assumed its final form, an opponent was to have an opportunity of petitioning the Secretary for Scotland and in that event the Order was to be referred to Parliament to go through the ordinary forms of a Provisional Order Bill, with this difference—that it would be submitted to a Joint Committee of both Houses instead of to a Committee of each House. The Joint Committee would have ample powers to give costs by a simple majority; and that would have a very deterrent effect upon petitioners. The effect of these proposals undoubtedly was to transfer in the case of all Bills that did not come before Parliament, all the power now vested in the Legislature to the Secretary for Scotland. ["Hear, hear"!] It was true that the Orders were to be deposited in the offices of the Chairmen of the two Houses. But the position of things now was that the Departments of the State reported to Parliament; and under these proposals that position of things would be reversed. The Chairmen would have power to report to the Secretary for Scotland, but there would be no obligation on him to attend to their recommendations. Therefore a large part of the power now vested in the Legislature would be transferred to a branch of the executive. Some persons were a little apt to leave out of sight the importance of the present procedure on unopposed Bills and the unopposed portions of opposed Bills. At present all such Bills were read before the beginning of the Session in the office of the Chairman of each House. They were noted, and the agents of the promoters were interviewed on the notes; and exception was taken to anything which appeared to be contrary to the public interest, to the practice of Parliament, or to the usual form in which Bills were presented. Points of the greatest importance almost always arose in connection with unopposed Bills, and under the proposals of Mr. Balfour neither he nor the Chairman of the House of Commons would have any opportunity of seeing the Reports of Public Departments or of interviewing the promoters and their agents. Their reading of the Bills must be much more perfunctory. Too much stress had been laid on the importance of the model Bills. They were good guides to the draftsman, but they were not intended to be rigid, and their clauses had to be adapted to new circumstances and combinations of circumstances. There was an important series of Bills this year—dealing with the laying down of electrical tramways—and with respect to these, very considerable alterations had been made in the model clauses. Then the model Bills by no means covered the whole ground of private Bill legislation. It was more important to keep to the established practice of Parliament, and to prevent provisions being put into Private Bills which ought not to be there. For instance, attempts were not infrequently made to introduce the punishment of imprisonment for a breach of the regulations of municipalities, and it had always been held that that was not a proper provision for Private Bills. Then, too, clauses were sometimes introduced extending the investments in which trustees might legally invest. All these questions were very important, they were hardly ever opposed, and they had to be dealt with with very great care and circumspection. But he would remind the House that, when he dealt with them as Chairman of Committees, he was absolutely responsible to Parliament. He was acting in large measure on the advice of an experienced legal adviser and on the reports of the public offices, and if his decisions or the decisions of the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons were wrong, they could always be appealed against in Parliament. That would not be the case with the Secretary for Scotland under this Bill, for the Bill placed him in a position much stronger and more irresponsible. There was another point in regard to the Secretary for Scotland's position—that was his relation to the other public departments. For instance, the Board of Trade had now power to issue Provisional Orders and pass confirming Acts through Parliament, though that power was limited to works the estimates of which did not exceed a certain sum. Under this Bill, as he understood it, the Secretary for Scotland would have power to order such works as the Board of Trade were now qualified to order, of any size, or of any importance; but he would not have the advantage of the expert advice which the Board of Trade enjoyed in those matters. He suggested to his noble Friend, whether it would not be possible to give within their own jurisdiction concurrent power to the Board of Trade to draw these Provisional Orders; otherwise he would be authorised to issue Orders dealing with larger matters than the Board of Trade, though he had neither the staff nor the experience to deal with them possessed by that Department. He would also remind the House that at present Bills were drawn by experienced agents, who were responsible to the House and to him for the manner in which the work was done. In future, if this Measure were passed, Bills would not be drawn by persons so experienced in Parliamentary practice and law. The result would be, that the Orders as presented to the Secretary for Scotland would require a good deal more careful revision and criticism than the Bills which were introduced into Parliament at the present time. He thought it was certain that discrepancies would arise between the Orders of the Secretary for Scotland and the Bills passed by Parliament. It was a question for Parliament to decide whether the simplification of procedure and the increased economy with which promoters would obtain their objects was not more than a compensation for this want of uniformity and this looseness of procedure. The only suggestion he could make whereby uniformity could be secured, and the control of Parliament, even in a slight degree, retained, was that all Orders, whether opposed or unopposed, should, as at present, pass through Parliament in confirming Bills, but if they had been before subject to local inquiry it should be contrary to the Standing Orders that at any stage in Parliament an opponent should appear against the Bill. He did not believe that would add to the cost or delay, and at any rate it would retain over these Bills a certain control on the part of Parliament, which would be capable of being exercised if occasion required. He was rather afraid that the noble Lord would say that this was contrary to the principle of his Bill. But he threw it out as a suggestion, and it was the only one he could make by which the control of Parliament could be retained to some extent without unnecessary expense. If that was not possible, he would at least suggest that the Secretary for Scotland should report to Parliament the proceedings taken in cases under this Bill. He was strongly in favour of the local inquiry as in matters of small moment a valuable method of getting at the truth; but in the case of large and important bills he did not expect much cheapness. He though it would be found by experience to be far more expensive to transport expert witnesses and legal advisers to distances from London and Edinburgh than it would be to transport non-expert witnesses to those centres. He did not think the experience of the Light Railways Commission was very promising in the matter of making local inquiries cheap. The panel from which the Commission was chosen was to consist of twelve men—six of them were to be versed in the matters to be dealt with and six were to be men of affairs. Was not the distinction too finely drawn between the two classes of Commissioners? He would suggest whether it would not be well to say "twelve competent persons." The second criticism he had to make in regard to the tribunal was more important. He doubted the desirableness of appointing a lawyer as Chairman of the Commission, especially one of such preponderating influence as a Judge or Sheriff. He suggested that it might be desirable on several grounds to attach a legal assessor to the Commission, who would both act as legal adviser to the Secretary for Scotland, and as a convenient medium of communication between him and the Chairmen of Committees of the two Houses of Parliament. Further, such an adviser would give some element of permanence to the Commission, for he would preserve its traditions, practices, and forms, and they were both numerous and important. Under Clause 7 it appeared to him doubtful whether the Secretary for Scotland would have any power to make modifications in an Order except those which were rendered necessary by the recommendation of the Commission; and he thought it was absolutely necessary that the Secretary for Scotland should have authority to introduce such modifications as might be required to bring a Bill into its proper and regular form. He would also like to point out to his noble Friend that under the Bill as at present the Chairmen of the two Houses would have no opportunity of seeing whether their suggestions as to Orders had been carried into effect or not. He wished to express his strong approval of the suggestion that after an Order had passed through the local inquiry it should only pass through one Committee in Parliament. He would, indeed, be very glad if eventually the system of Joint Committees of both Houses might have larger extensions than it had in this Bill. It would save a great deal of the time of Parliament, and also a great deal of expense on the part of suitors. Another point was that it rested with the opponents or the promoters of Bills to ask the Secretary of State that they should be introduced as Private Bills rather than as Orders. He ventured to think the Secretary of State or some one else ought to have the power on his own initiative to send a Bill as a Private Bill to Parliament. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not think it would occur in many cases. This year Scottish Private Bill legislation consisted altogether of 30 Bills, of which one related to a public company—and that was a class of Bill which he thought should be dealt with by Parliament—three related to large municipalities that were not included now in the Police of Scotland Act, 12 related to railways, and 14 to other matters. His own impression was that there were very few of these which would have come to Parliament; most of them would have come under the purview of the noble

Lord's Act, and, indeed, he thought a very large proportion of Scottish private legislation would be so dealt with. The effect undoubtedly would in all ordinary cases to transfer the legislative power from Parliament to the Secretary of State. He quite admitted that it was a very well considered attempt in the direction of the reform which was desired, and that it would very materially assist the Scottish suitors, especially in small and purely local matters. He could not help feeling, however, a little misgiving at so large a transference of power from the Legislature to the executive. ["Hear, hear!"] He confessed he should like to see some control in Parliament over the action of the Secretary of State for Scotland, and he saw none at all in this Bill. He should like to have seen the process of Scottish as well as English and Irish legislation cheapened and simplified, while retaining Parliamentary control, which might be exercised as the occasion arose, over that legislation. It would be interesting to see what the opinion of Scottish constituencies would be. The Bill was very important and far-reaching, because, if adopted, it would certainly be used as a precedent for other parts of the United Kingdom. He trusted his noble Friend would give them time to consider the provisions of such an important and complicated Measure. ["Hear, hear!"]

*The Earl of CAMPERDOWN said he concurred with almost every word that had fallen from the Chairman of Committees. He thought this Bill would have a larger effect and wider scope than seemed to be supposed. He wished to lay stress on the enormous power given by this Bill to the Secretary for Scotland. He quite agreed with the authors of the Bill that it was right to proceed by Provisional Order, and thought that was the only direction that was open to them. But this Bill went further, and placed in the hands of the Secretary for Scotland almost absolutely, and for the first time, the whole Private Bill business for Scotland. Hitherto the Secretary for Scotland, who, of course, changed with the Government, had had nothing whatever to do with Private Bill legislation, which had been in the hands of the two Houses, and particularly in the hands of the Chairman of Committees and the Chairman of Ways and Means. The two Chairmen, however, were placed by this Bill in a very secondary position. Even after an inquiry had taken place, the Secretary of State could refuse to issue an Order at all, and there was nothing to say that he was to give rhyme or reason for such action. He might also make modifications. He was then to send a copy of the Order to the two Chairmen, but there was no power, so far as he could see, to the Chairmen to make any alteration in the Order. He submitted that this control of Private Bill legislation was not a proper sphere at all for the Secretary for Scotland, who had ample occupation at the present time in the general supervision of public measures in Parliament, and in various very important executive duties. The powers which it was now proposed to give him would occupy his whole time, even if he were competent to deal with these matters, but he submitted the Secretary of State was not fitted to deal with them, and had no experience of anything of the kind. With regard to administrative work of this kind they had very considerable experience of the Secretary for Scotland as an official—he did not refer to the noble Lord himself—and that was by no means of a favourable character. [*Laughter.*] Moreover, the Chairman of Committees and the Chairman of Ways and Means were particularly well fitted to deal with this private business. He would suggest that the Secretary for Scotland should be excised almost entirely from this Bill; he referred particularly to the powers which were given him in Clause 7. Half of the members of the proposed tribunal were to be "persons versed in matters in respect of which Parliamentary powers were wont to be sought." If this meant lawyers or professional persons of some sort, he must enter a respectful protest against gentlemen of that kind being on a tribunal to decide matters of this kind. His personal experience, which he was sure would be confirmed by every Scotch Peer in the House who had anything to do with legal business in Scotland, was that an enormous amount of canvassing would be carried on by gentlemen anxious to have the six paid places for obvious reasons. In the first place, the position would give them a good deal of immediate business and some dignity, and if they obtained a position on the panel their own private business would be indirectly promoted. Everybody would feel that one of these gentlemen must be the person to employ. He would be regarded as a person very much thought of by his Lord Provost, or the Convener of his county, or the Secretary for Scotland. The proposed mode of appointment was all the worse because it was unnecessary. There were plenty of men of business and men of affairs who would be quite prepared to undertake the duties without being paid. Unpaid men were likely to be better than paid men. He hoped this portion of the Bill would be given up in Committee. He deprecated the appointment of a Judge or Sheriff. A large demand on their time would be involved, and he did not think, with every respect for the Bench, that it was necessary that that demand should be made. They did not have legal assessors on Private Bill Committees, and he believed their decisions commanded to a large extent public confidence. He hoped that the Bill would be sent to a Standing Committee. It was most desirable in the public interest that the Chairman of Committees, Lord Morley, should be in a position to advise the House with regard to an important matter of this sort, which was his own peculiar province. If the Bill were considered in Standing Committee, he hoped they would have the assistance of the Chairman of Committees. As far as he could see, the Bill was a very considerable advance. It was not an ambitious Bill. As far as he could judge, it was a sensible Bill in the principle it laid down, and he thought it was likely to confer considerable benefit on Scotland.

Lord BALFOUR said he certainly had no reason to complain of the manner in which his attempt to deal with this subject on behalf of the Government had been received by the House. There had been no attempt from any quarter to controvert the proposition that some reform in the present system was required, and the provisions of the Bill had not been strongly criticised except in points of detail by either of the two noble Lords who first addressed the House; and the noble Lord who last spoke distinctly said he thought, after the previous history of the question and the previous efforts made, there was no resource left to those who desired to attempt reform but to admit that reform by means of an extension of Provisional Order legislation. He himself came to that conclusion as far back as 1888. This was the Bill alluded to in the Queen's Speech at the commencement of the Session, and there had been no change of intention on the part of those responsible for the Bill. In regard to the shortness of time between the presentation of the Bill and the Second Reading, to get the Second Reading before Whitsuntide it was necessary, for various reasons, the noble Lord explained, to take it that day. It would be convenient that a little time should elapse between the Second Reading and subsequent stages, and no attempt would be made to take any further stage before the Whitsuntide Recess. Lord Tweedmouth was not hostile to the Bill, but exhibited a tendency to minimise the reform which would be effected by the Bill. He himself did not describe it as a larger Measure than it was, for fear of exciting expectations which it would not be possible afterwards to satisfy. But Lord Morley put the matter on its true basis. It was his intention, and he believed it was distinctly foreshadowed in the Bill, that, if it passed, the system of legislation by Provisional Order would become the rule, and the existing system, as far as Scotland was concerned, would be the exception. Directions were given in the Bill to the Secretary for Scotland and the Chairmen of Committees that if any proposal which came before them raised a question of policy or principle, it should be determined by Parliament, and the procedure would be by Private Bill. They would have to consider, not whether it was convenient for promoter or opponent that that course should be taken, but whether the questions raised were of a character and magnitude which rendered it necessary to deal with them by Private Bill. Those acquainted with the subject knew it was difficult to define all the subjects that came before Parliament in the name of Private Bill legislation, that no course was open but to give some general directions of this kind, and that any attempt to define what proposals should be dealt with one way or the other would be foredoomed to failure. The Secretary for Scotland would be associated with the Chairmen of Committees in deciding the matter. It would tend to give confidence to those in Scotland interested in the subject that the question whether procedure should be by Provisional Order or private Bill should not be decided on the prepossessions of the Chairmen of Committees of the two Houses, but that they would have the advice and the tendency of the Secretary for Scotland to modify their decision in the direction of having more Provisional Orders and fewer private Bills in the future. He would not follow the noble Lord into his complaint that there was no Scotch legislation last year. It was not quite germane to the point before the House, but he would remind him that there was such a Measure as the Agricultural Rating Bill, which applied to Scotland, and Bills which applied to England were equally to the interest of Scotland, which was also included in the Light Railways Act and other Acts passed by the Legislature last year. He thought he had now said enough with reference to the point as to the Report of the Committee of 1888 having been set aside by him. He had put aside these proposals for this reason—on three or four occasions since the presentation of that Report, schemes which were founded upon it had been submitted to Parliament, but only in one case was a Second Reading reached, and in that case when the Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the other House, it was so changed and altered that the Government of the day did not proceed with it. The real difficulty of the whole question was how they were to obtain the practical benefits of local inquiry, and at the same time preserve the effective supremacy of Parliament, and he agreed with the last speaker that the most hopeful solution of the difficulty was rather to be found in the Provisional Order system than in any other system which had been suggested. Lord Tweedmouth had told the House that the Bill to which he referred must have cost £1,000 for preliminary notices at 9s. apiece. That statement had surprised him greatly, and he thought that there must have been some special reason which they did not know for that heavy expenditure. His own impression was that such expenditure was wholly unnecessary, and that Glasgow, like other large cities employing town clerks, might have done the business at much less cost. But even if it were necessary now under the Standing Orders to spend 9s. upon each of these notices, it would not be necessary under this Bill, because power was given by it to prescribe the conditions under which notices should be given, and there was nothing to prevent its being prescribed that these notices should be sent by registered letter. One criticism which had been passed on this Measure by all those who had spoken was that there was too much of the Secretary for Scotland in the Bill. He thought that the position which it was proposed to give the Secretary for Scotland was rather misunderstood. It was not intended to give him unchecked power to do what he liked with the Bills submitted to him. As far as the opposed clauses of a Bill were concerned the intention was that the Secretary for Scotland should only make such alterations in the draft Provisional Order as were recommended by the tribunal which had heard the parties, and as far as unopposed clauses were concerned his proposal was that the Secretary for Scotland should only make such changes as he was advised by the Chairman of Committees were necessary in order to bring those clauses into conformity with the general practice of Parliament respecting Provisional Orders. If his intentions with regard to this matter were not clearly embodied in the provisions of the Bill, there would be no difficulty in amending it so as to remove all ambiguity. There was a provision in the Bill which allowed any opponent of a Provisional Order to require that it should be laid before Parliament, and he was, in addition, prepared to consider the propriety of laying the Order before Parliament upon the initiative or demand of the Chairman of Committees of either House, although by this concession he feared that he might be encouraging criticism of the Bill as a measure of reform and relief. He had been asked whether an omnibus Bill could be the subject of a Provisional Order under the Bill, and he saw nothing to prevent it. The intention, in fact, was to include what were known as omnibus Bills. Being made up of a large collection of comparatively small points, omnibus Bills constituted precisely that class of legislation which ought to be the subject of local inquiry, because such Bills seldom contained large questions of principle. The noble Earl who preceded him in the Debate had made some rather severe comments upon the proposed method of selecting the panel from whom those who were to preside over these Inquiries were to chosen, and he had criticised particularly the proposal respecting the appointment of a judge or sheriff. But it surely was desirable that there should be some one upon the tribunal who had a knowledge of the law of evidence and of legal matters. He was, however, quite willing to consider the suggestion that there should be a legal assessor instead. He had been sorry to hear Lord Tweedmouth's remarks concerning the choice of the conveners of counties as a Committee of selection. He trusted that the noble Lord would accept his assurance that when he made that choice he did not give a thought to their political complexion. He might point out that those who elected the County Councils in Scotland were almost the same as those who elected Members of Parliament. If the conveners of counties inclined more to his own political views than to those of the noble Lord, the fact remained that they were the persons best fitted in the opinion of the electorate to fill the positions to which they were returned. He could not help thinking that it was unfortunate that the noble Lord should have raised the question of the political complexion of this proposed Committee of selection, because he felt certain that political considerations would not sway the minds of those who would form that Committee, and he always noticed that when people were put into quasi-judicial positions they made fair selections without regarding the political complexion of those whom they selected. But he was not wedded to this particular method of selecting the tribunal, and if a better could be suggested, he would give it most fair and impartial consideration. He was certain, however, that any proposal to submit the matter to the Executive Government of the day would meet with great opposition, because it would at once be presumed that the appointments were to be political. Replying to his noble Friend (the Earl of Morley) he assured him that it was not his intention to assume any of the functions of the Chairman of Committees. Lord Tweedmouth had expressed the opinion that to allow the Secretary for Scotland to remit a Bill to Parliament on the Motion of one opponent was to give him too much power. He should have thought that the question of the power given to the Secretary of State would fade into insignificance when compared with so important a question as that of the right of a party desiring it to appeal to Parliament. Everybody agreed that in some form or other the retention of the ultimate control of both Houses of Parliament must be secured. The necessity for that was recognised in every Report on this subject, and by nearly every witness who gave evidence before the Committee of 1888. It was recognised, for example, by Mr. Pember, Mr. Beveridge, who was a Parliamentary agent, and by Mr. Pym, and all three were in favour of a much larger scheme of devolution than that now proposed. No man's status ought to be interfered with without the sanction of Parliament, and he would not be responsible for any scheme that disregarded that principle. He had now replied to all the points that had been raised. He was not disappointed at the reception given to the Bill. The criticisms passed upon it only proved how great were the difficulties in the way of dealing with this subject satisfactorily. He trusted that ultimately the Measure might receive the sanction of Parliament.

Lord HERSCHELL, while agreeing without reserve to the proposal that there should be a power of appeal to Parliament, suggested that a single individual ought not to be allowed to render nugatory all the proceedings already taken by the time his appeal was lodged. He also suggested whether, in order to prevent this action from being improperly taken, the Committee should not be enabled to give costs even by a majority against the person failing. It had been found to work extremely well in many cases not to give any absolute right of appeal, and yet not to leave the party without the power of appealing if he had a real case. In certain cases in the Privy Council, in order to be enabled to appeal, the party who desired it must come before the Judicial Committee and satisfy them that he had sufficient ground for appealing. The matter was always very carefully considered, and unless the Committee was satisfied that there appeared to be good ground to believe that the judgment below was wrong, the leave to appeal was refused. This course was adopted in the Clergy Discipline Act, and he believed that where it had been adopted it had worked well. Would it not be possible to adopt the idea embodied in that legislation in such a Measure as this—not to give the individual an absolute right to compel the proceedings in that House to be gone through again as if there had been no inquiry, but to require that there should be a petition presented and an inquiry into it by a Committee. This would be a practical check on any improper proceedings to get rid of the work done before, and would be a more effectual one than the mere fear of having to pay costs.

Bill Read a Second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order); Repoted without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

QUARTER SESSIONS JURORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be Read 3ª To-morrow.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL [H.L.].

Report of Amendments (which stands appointed for this day) put off till To-morrow.

NAVY AND MARINES (WILLS) ACT (1865) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND).

Lord HERSCHELL asked Her Majesty's Government whether they would undertake at an early date to introduce a Bill amending the law relating to the municipal franchise in Ireland? He pointed out that towards the close of the Session in 1895 a Bill for amending the law relating to the municipal franchise in Ireland was Read a Second time in their Lordships' House, the Bill having come up from the House of Commons. On that occasion the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland supported the Second Reading of the Bill. The noble Earl said, "On his own behalf, and he believed on behalf of his colleagues, they felt as strongly as I did the necessity which undoubtedly existed for dealing with the question of the municipal franchise in Ireland;" and the noble Earl expressed his desire that the Bill should be Read a Second time. The next stage of the Bill was taken shortly before the prorogation, and then the Lord Lieutenant opposed any further proceeding with the Bill on the ground that it was impossible to discuss it at that time. He ventured to point out that if the Measure was not passed then it was extremely probable that those who had been pressing this amendment of the law for many years would have to wait as many years again before it was passed, on which remark he observed that there were cries of "No!" and "Why!" He thought that the incidents which had happened during the two years gave some answer to the "No" and the "Why!" A Division took place and the Bill was lost. The Measure was declared to be one which had the sympathy and the support of the present Government, and it was regarded by them not only as a just and desirable amendment of the law, but as one which urgently needed to be dealt with. He did not think that there could be two opinions as to either of those propositions, and he would remind the House that it had always been, as they understood, a cardinal part of the policy of the present Government, and it had been constantly reiterated by them, that any measure of Home Rule for Ireland was absolutely unnecessary, inasmuch as any just and reasonable demand for an amendment of the law would meet with speedy response from Parliament as at present constituted. So much for the general aspect of the case. Owing to the difficulty which had been experienced in obtaining any reform of the franchise by general legislation, Bills had been introduced from time to time dealing with particular Corporations, and Parliament had in several cases, in view, no doubt, of the difficulty and delay which has taken place in dealing with the general question, sanctioned the introduction into these Bills of causes dealing with the municipal franchise in the several boroughs to which they refer. These Measures had been passed into law. The precedent was followed by the introduction of similar clauses in a Bill relating to the Corporation of Dublin. The Measure came before their Lordships the other day, and by a small majority an Instruction was carried, the effect of which was to expunge those clauses from the Bill and to render certain that it would go down to the other House without them, therefore rendering it probable that the Bill would be rejected. This would of course, result in a very considerable waste of money. The money was wasted when the Bill was promoted with these clauses inserted last year, and the money would be wasted on the present occasion. It was on these special grounds that he put this question, because it seemed to him that the only thing which could prevent that waste of money was that the Government should announce their intention speedily to introduce such a Measure. If such an announcement were made and the Bill introduced, it was possible that the other House might be content to forego the course which they would otherwise likely follow, of rejecting the Bill by refusing to assent to the Amendments made by their Lordships. On the occasion he had referred to the Lord Chancellor spoke in favour of letting these clauses remain in the Bill at that time, on the ground that other Corporations had been allowed to insert such clauses in their Bills; and he believed that this view was supported by many Members of the present Cabinet.

LORD MONTEAGLE appealed to the Government to give a favourable reply, if they could see their way, to the question of the noble and learned Lord. This grievance which pressed upon these towns in Ireland was of much greater magnitude in one respect than any other grievance Ireland had to complain of, because it was peculiar to Ireland. The question of private Bill procedure was also a grievance in Ireland. The Chief Secretary, in answer to a deputation at the end of last year, gave a definite pledge that the question of private Bill legislation in Ireland should be dealt with. No such definite pledge had been given as to the municipal franchise, and he hoped the Government would now give one.

THE EARL OF MAYO did not gather from the noble and learned Lord whether he wanted the Bill spoken of by the Lord Lieutenant in 1895 or another Bill. What sort of Franchise Bill was wanted? The question was most important to the people in Ireland. He agreed that there would be a great waste of money if the Dublin Corporation Bill were rejected, and on that account only he hoped that the Bill would not be lost. The subject of Private Bill legislation, again, was a burning question in Ireland, and he hoped the Government, when the time came, would see to it, especially in view of the great costs which corporations and other bodies were put to in having to come over here to fight their case. If they could have private Bill legislation dealt with in Ireland it would be an immense thing.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH was afraid the answer he had to give would hardly be considered satisfactory by the noble and learned Lord. He could only say that the Government, although they realised that the municipal franchise question in Ireland must be dealt with sooner or later, were unable to undertake to deal with it this Session.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS.

*VISCOUNT TEMPLETOWN rose to ask Her Majesty's Government whether the proposed Commission on the Irish Land question would have power to examine and report upon the pledges given by the Government of the day on the passing of the Land Act of 1881; and as to whether the circumstances contemplated by Government which would raise a claim for compensation had arisen. In doing so, the noble Lord drew attention to some points in connection with the Land Acts. In the first place, he set himself to show the interdependence that exists among the various Land Acts; secondly, the difficulties of lawyers and experts in administering the Acts; and, thirdly, that there was a general consensus of opinion that there ought to be a general inquiry into the Acts, and that losses had been sustained by landlords, was supported by very great authority. With reference to the first point, he recalled the fact that when Mr. Justice FitzGibbon was examined before Mr. Morley's Commission, Mr. Morley asked (Question 2969, page 140):—

> "I think the Committee, so far as I can judge, certainly including myself, feel that unprofessional persons must be perplexed beyond measure by the enormous difficulties of construction arising from the interdependence of the various Acts which refer to one another, in and out, of which you as a Court I suppose must have felt the difficulty as we laymen. I should like to hear if you would be kind enough to tell the Committee an account of the relations of those Acts to one another, and any statement that you may care to make of the difficulties arising from those relations."

The answer of Mr. Justice FitzGibbon was as follows:—

> "I can scarcely exaggerate the difficulty that has arisen in two ways. First, from the artificial system of definition that exists in these Acts, by which we have first to learn a special language before we try to find out what the interpretation of a particular erection is, we must know the language before we proceed to interpret it, and it is a foreign language to lawyers."

Mr. Edward Carson, one of the Members for the University of Dublin, speaking at the Surveyors' Institute in London in November, 1893, was reported to have said:—

> "If there was one thing more than another that he wished to impress upon those who came into daily contact with this Question, it was that they would not approach the Question from the standpoint of English land tenure, but must consider whether more or less legislation was required, and indeed, first ascertained how existing legislation dealt with the whole matter seeing what the existing legislation was."

Again, Judge O'Connor Morris, writing in *The Fortnightly Review* of June, 1896, in the article, "The Irish Land Bill of Lord Salisbury's Government," said:—

> "It does not attempt to place the land system of Ireland, at least in its most important relations, on a more stable and sound foundation, or essentially to change the legislation of late years, which has torn it, it may be truly said, to pieces," and further, "a Government which commands the field of politics might have made an earnest and thorough effort to set the Irish Land System on a better basis; in its largest and most important province, to reconcile it in some measure at least with the conceptions of just and civilised law, to mitigate in part without doing violence to existing or recently acquired rights, the gross wrongs and the vexatious evils of an ill designed and revolutionary scheme of reform. Legislation of this kind, however, must have been preceded by a careful, protracted, and impartial inquiry into the present state of the Irish Land System and into the operation and effects of the Gladstonian Land Act," . . . .

Again he said:—

> "Land tenure in Ireland must be thoroughly recast if the Land System is to rest on a sound basis."

Mr. Lecky, in his work, "Democracy and Liberty," says:—

> "The Act of 1870 had many merits, but it admitted, as I believe, a dangerous and dishonest principle."

Mr. T. W. Russell was reported in *The Irish Times* of October 13th, 1894, to have used these words:—

> "People talk about the Act of 1881. The Act of 1870 governs it at every point."

If they looked at the Act of 1881 they found it incorporated a great part of the Act of 1870. Any provision in the Act of 1870 not inconsistent with those of the Act of 1881 remain good, and the two, by Section 57 of the Act of 1881, "shall be construed together as one Act." What did the newspaper which represents the Ulster tenants say as to an Inquiry? *The Northern Wig* of May 12th says:—

> "If the Government decide on recommending a Commission of Inquiry it ought to be a broad and general one, and not of mere politicians, nor of peers, nor of landlords."

When Mr. Arthur Balfour spoke the other day in the House of Commons he condemned all the Acts. What effect had that speech produced in Ireland? A friend wrote:—

> "He (Mr. Arthur Balfour) in effect said, that none of the Land Acts can be any longer defended, and that the Conservative Party which only tried to make them work, not approving of them, now see that they never will work, and must be superseded by some more statesmanlike, simple, and just legislation."

Mr. Arthur Balfour had, in the face of the country, made this tremendous admission, but, great as it was, he doubted if it was stronger, except that Mr. Arthur Balfour was the Leader of the Unionist Party in the House of Commons, than the words of *The Times* that the landlords of Ireland demand an Inquiry into a

> "state of things which, to say the very least, is altogether without a parallel in any country, civilised or uncivilised."

Now, he might fairly ask how long was Ireland to groan under such a state of affairs? Mr. Gerald Balfour, in introducing the Irish Land Bill, referred to the Act of 1881 as nothing less than an "agrarian revolution." Were the Irish landlords not only to suffer for this revolution, of which they were not the cause, but to be punished by having their property confiscated under the laws of England into the bargain? No words of his could strengthen the overwhelming indictment pronounced by judicial authorities, by statesmen and historians and experts, against the Irish Land Acts passed by the English Legislature during the last quarter of a century, and which if they were to believe the Irish tenantry, left them no better off than they were before. So far, he claimed to have shown that the Irish Land Act of 1870 and those following were so closely knit together that if full and complete justice was to be done alike to landlords and tenants in Ireland the inquiry could not be confined to one Act only; and, further, the quotations he had given pointed to the need of a general inquiry into all the Acts to ascertain the losses suffered by landlords under all the Acts, and how compensation should be given them. He would now deal with the pledges given by the Government of the day on the passing of the Irish Land Act of 1870. Speaking of "Those who have set up perpetuity of tenure for the Irish occupier as their favourite scheme," Mr. Gladstone disclaimed anything—

> "dishonourable, anything that intends any injury to another's on their part, because we have not a doubt that they have seen that inasmuch as perpetuity of tenure on the part of the occupier is virtually expropriation of the landlord, and as a mere readjustment of rent according to the price of produce can by no means dispose of all contingencies the future may produce in his favour, compensation would have to be paid to the landlord for the rights of which he would be deprived. . . . But suppose for a moment that we put the financial difficulty out of view, what would be the effect of perpetuity of tenure upon the tenant? As I understand it, the scheme itself amounts to this—that each and every occupier, as long as he pays the rent that he is now paying, or else some rent to be fixed by a public tribunal charged with the duty of valuation, is to be secured for himself and his heirs in the occupation of the land that he holds, without limit of time. He will be subject only to this condition somewhat in the nature of the commutation of Tithe Act—that with a variation in the value of produce the rent may vary but it will be slightly, and at somewhat distant periods. The effect of that provision will be, that the landlord will become a rent charge upon what is now his own estate. The Legislature has, no doubt, the perfect right to reduce him to that condition, giving him proper compensation for any loss he may sustain in money; the State has a perfect right to deal with his social status, and to reduce him to that condition if it thinks fit. But then it is bound not to so think fit, unless it is shown that this is for the public good."

Viscount Templetown.

Did this not describe the condition of landlords and tenants in Ireland to-day? Speaking further on in the Debate, Mr. Gladstone said:—

> "Well, now, let us look closely at the case of Ireland, and see whether, in good faith, without injury to any class, we can provide a remedy for these evils. . . . . And as we have afforded the occupier improved security of tenure, so also have we afforded the landlord improved security for his rent, and improved security as we think for the better cultivation of his land."

The then Attorney General, Sir Robert Collier said in his speech of March 8, 1870:—

> "When they say that the landlord ought not to have power of ejecting the tenant except for non-payment of rent, and that the tenant has a right to remain on his holding as long as he pleases, what does that really mean but fixity of tenure—that is, that the landlord is to be deprived of his property?"

And again:—

> "I believe the effect of the Measure will be, by giving the tenant security of tenure, to give him increased motives for industry, and, by giving to the tenant security of tenure, it will, at the same time, give to the landlords an increase of rent."

Mr. Gladstone had distinctly admitted the fact that his Land Act of 1870 took away from the owners of land in Ireland a part of their property and made it over to the tenants. In his speech of April 7th, 1881, when he introduced the Act of that year, he said:—

> "With a supply of land in the market so much less than the demand, you have a state of things in which it is well worth the while of a man who has not got land as a means of

obtaining a regular subsistence and livelihood, to pay for obtaining it. That willingness of the incoming tenant to pay enters distinctly into the interest of the outgoing tenant so long as he continues the tenant, as something he has to receive."

The principle of compensation was admitted by Mr. Gladstone in 1881, when he said:—

> "If, as has been said, Parliament is about to invade the property of Irish landlords, the question of compensation becomes a very serious one indeed, and one concerning which, if we are prepared to deal with it at all, we ought to speak in most decisive terms. If these classes, either or both of them, have a just claim to compensation in consequence of the manner in which these interests will be affected by this Bill, we are bound as a Parliament to give it them."

He would quote one case which showed clearly the state of affairs in Ireland. It was the case of "Bolton landlord," which was heard at Dundalk on February 11th last, to determine the true value of the holding. The holding comprised 79 acres, 2 roods, and 19 perches Irish. The rent £103. There were no improvements claimed by the tenant. The land had been let previously by the landlord to the tenant, and the tenant had paid no fine to get possession of the farm. On the hearing, the landlord produced two valuers, one of them Mr. J. J. Russell, who described the farm as in a very bad condition. He said:—

> "There is nothing in the farm which usually goes to make up what is known as a tenant-right interest—no houses, no fences, no unexhausted manures, no improvements of any kind. On the contrary, a considerable permissive waste is allowed to go on, evidently with the object of getting a low rent fixed in a year or two."

After making allowances for repairs, etc., he valued the tenant's interest, or the true value, at £83. The landlord produced another valuer, Mr. M'Ilvaine, County Court valuer, Mr. M'Ilvaine, Mr. M'Ilvaine considered the rent was too high; he estimated that it would be reduced 25 per cent. two years hence; and he considered the tenant's interest was 15 years' purchase of the reduction. In all, he estimated that tht true value would be between £400 and £500. The tenant produced two witnesses, who stated that they believed the tenant's interest was worth from £1,000 to £1,200, perhaps more. The Sub-Commissioners fixed the true value at £550. The question was, what was that £550 for? Was it not a part of the corpus of the landlord's estate, and should it not belong to him? There were no improvements claimed by the tenant. The evidence showed that the place had been grossly deteriorated, and was it reasonable and fair that a landlord, to resume possession of the farm, should pay the tenant this amount for getting his land back in a grossly deteriorated state? Surely the Act of 1881 never contemplated that the portion of the corpus of the estate of the landlord should be transferred to the tenant. Speaking as he had done, on his own behalf and on behalf of others, with a view to what was just between man and man in Ireland, and what was best for the whole community both in Great Britain and Ireland, he urged that a great wrong had been done to the Irish landlords, for which compensation was due; and, for the moment, the responsibility of action rested with Her Majesty's Government.

The Earl of DENBIGH: I can only refer the noble Viscount to the speech which was made by the Chief Secretary in another place a few days ago, in which the right hon. Gentleman stated that the proposed Commission in connection with the Irish Land Acts would be confined to inquiring into the practice and procedure of the Land Commission and the County Courts in fixing fair rents, and of the Land Commission in making advances under the Land Purchase Acts. At this moment it is impossible to give the noble Viscount any more details as to the terms of reference to the Commission, and I cannot now go into other particulars.

The Earl of MAYO said that those whose property had been dealt with would like to know as soon as possible the *personnel* of the Commission, the terms of reference, and the name of the Secretary to the Commission. As to the question of compensation, he believed that the Royal Commission could take that question into consideration, though it could not fix the compensation or grant it. He was glad that the matter had been brought forward.

House Adjourned at Seven o'Clock, till To-morrow, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LLANDUDNO URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Considered as amended.

Clause 2,—

POWER TO SET APART LANDS FOR GAMES.

(1) The Council may set apart for cricket, football, golf, and other games portions of any park or place of public resort or recreation for the time being belonging to or held by them (other than the recreation ground known as the Happy Valley), and may purchase or take on lease additional lands and lay out and improve and set apart the same, or any portion thereof, for the like purposes, so, however, that all lands so set apart shall be open to the public when not in use for such games.

(2) The Council may make bye-laws for regulating the use of any lands so set apart, provided that no bye-law which shall restrict any existing right to military user shall have effect until approved by the Secretary of State for War.

(3) The Council may erect, provide, and maintain on any such lands set apart for games and recreation any pavilion or pavilions, building or buildings, or any refreshment or other room or rooms or conveniences connected therewith.

(4) The Council may make, or authorise others to make, such charges as the Council may deem reasonable for admission to such pavilions and buildings or refreshment rooms or other room or rooms or conveniences connected therewith, or may let on lease for any term not exceeding five years, any such pavilions or buildings or refreshment rooms or other room or rooms or conveniences connected therewith.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) moved in Sub-section (2) to leave out the words "any existing right to military user" in order to insert the words "the military user in case of national or local emergency."

MR. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouth, N.) said that, as a member of the Police and Sanitary Committee before whom the Bill had come, he objected to the proposed Amendment. When the Bill originally came before the Committee it contained the words now sought to be inserted, and they were informed that they were inserted in it at the instance of the War Office with the consent of the promoters of the Measure. The difficulty in which the Committee found themselves placed was that if they retained the words in the question they would be either sanctioning an important alteration of the law or be making a declaration of the existing law. In the latter case, of course, the words now sought to be inserted were absolutely unnecessary, and, moreover, the Committee were directly prohibited from making such a declaration by a Resolution of that House. On the other hand, if by retaining the words they would be making an alteration in the existing law, and would be conferring new powers upon the War Office, they believed that such an alteration of the law should be effected by means of a public Bill and not by a clause in a Private Measure. It was on that ground that they had struck out the words which it was now sought to reinsert. The House was aware that the Police and Sanitary Committee, although not absolutely bound to do so, felt themselves constraned to act upon certain rules of procedure, under one of which they would not allow to be introduced into a Private Bill any proposal to alter the general law of the land, unless the peculiar local circumstances were such as to induce them to make a change in that law. The question before the Committee, therefore, was, was there any peculiarity in the local circumstances of Llandudno as would entitle the War Office to have powers over the open spaces of the district other than those which they had over such open spaces in the country generally. The Committee had come to the conclusion that there were no such special circumstances in the case as would justify them in giving the special power asked for by the War Office. Had the Committee acted otherwise than they did, what reasons could they have given to the House in their Report for making this change in the general law of the land in this particular Private Bill? It it were thought desirable that the War Office should have these special powers over open spaces all over the country, the right hon. Gentleman should bring forward a public Bill upon the subject, and not seize upon the opportunity for giving them in reference to a particular locality afforded by the introduction of a private Bill. The Committee objected to the promoters of private Bills being compelled, under the threat of having their measures opposed by the War Department, to assent to any terms which the War Office might choose to impose upon them. In one instance the Under Secretary for War had written a letter to the Chairman of Committees instructing him to take such steps as he thought necessary to require a Select Committee appointed by that House to introduce into a private Bill such changes in the general law of the land which were desired by the Department without any special reasons being given for that course being adopted. On these grounds, on behalf of the Committee of which he had the honour of being a member, and also in defence of the privileges of that House, he felt it to be his duty to oppose the Amendment, and if the right hon. Gentleman pressed the matter he should be compelled to divide the House on the question. [" Hear, hear ! "]

*MR. BRODRICK said that the hon. Gentleman opposite had endeavoured to make a great deal out of what was, after all, but a very simple question. The various local authorities frequently came to that House, asking for powers to deal with open spaces in their districts, and the War Office thought it only right that in such cases power should be reserved to the Department to use the lands so dealt with for military purposes in case of local or national emergencies. The hon. Member complained that the War Office had been asking for special legislation by means of this Bill. There was no demand for special legislation at all; on the contrary, the clause had been accepted by the promoters of the Bill; as had been the case in other similar Bills. The contention of the Department was that it was necessary to reserve power to the War Office to use open spaces in case of national or local emergencies. The mayor of a town might telegraph for troops for the purpose of assisting the police in the maintenance of local order, and the troops sent in compliance with that request might find themselves without shelter and without any place but the streets to remain in. Such a state of things would be most inconvenient from every point of view. It was, moreover, usually of importance that the troops should be so placed as to be out of sight of the public and out of the range of missiles which might be thrown until their services were actually required. As there were in most instances no barracks in which they could obtain shelter for the night, it was both desirable and necessary that they should be encamped on such open spaces as were available for the purpose. In his opinion, the Committee had taken a very narrow view of their functions in connection with this matter, and had struck out these words against the wish of the promoters. He hoped that the House would insert the Amendment he had moved in the Bill. [" Hear, hear ! "]

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that, although he agreed that the War Office should have power to make use of open spaces for military purposes in times of local or national emergencies, he thought that such power should be conferred by a public and not by a private Bill. He believed that under the common law of the land the War Office already possessed such a power in the case, at all events, of national emergencies, and that in any case the Department would not hesitate to use the lands if necessity required. If the hon. Member opposite divided, he should vote against the Amendment. [" Hear, hear ! "]

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) hoped that the House would not accept the Amendment. He objected to pressure by the War Office being brought to bear upon small localities to consent to the insertion of such clauses in their private Bills. [" Hear, hear ! "]

MR. T. R. LEUTY (Leeds, E.) said that those who represented small districts were sure to give way to pressure from the War Office in order to smooth the way for their Billls. He trusted that the House would support the decision of their Committee to strike out these words. [" Hear ! "]

MR. W. JONES (Carnarvon, Arfon) suggested that the matter should be postponed until fuller information on the matter could be laid before the House.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Walsall) thought that the objections to the proposal of the War Office had been very much exaggerated. The War Office was not asking for additional powers. The Town Council was doing so, and the War Office proposed a limitation in the public interest. If this Amendment were rejected and the War Office required to use the lands under its common law right, it would be met by a bye-law having the force of an Act of Parliament unless it could prove the state of things at the time of passing the Act. *Inter arma silent leges*, and no difficulty ought to be put in the way of the troops in cases of emergency.

Question put "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 96 ; Noes, 124.—(Division List No. 211.) Words inserted.

Bill to be Read the Third time.

QUESTIONS.

FISHERY CRUISERS.

Mr. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) : I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the names of the cruisers engaged in protecting the interests of line fishermen off the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland respectively?

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. W. G. E. Macartney, Antrim, S.) : The vessels so employed at present are the *Jackal*, *Daisy*, *Hearty*, *Onyx*, *Leda*, *Beatrice*, and *Spanker*, off the coast of Great Britain, and the *Flora* off the coast of Ireland.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Mr. WEIR : I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the fact that, under the Public Health (Scotland) Bill, the majority of the black houses in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland will be liable to be condemned as insanitary dwellings, will he consider the advisability of introducing into the Congested Districts Bill a provision rendering the crofters and fishermen assistance in the erection of suitable dwellings ?

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Graham Murray, Buteshire) : The point raised by the hon. Member will have the consideration of the Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. WEIR : I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session a Bill to deal with the grant in aid of congested districts in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland ; and, if so, will he state when the Bill will be introduced ?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) : I hope this Bill will be introduced in the course of the present Session. Whether time will be found for its discussion depends upon the reception it meets with from hon. Gentlemen.

Mr. WEIR asked at what date the Bill would be introduced ?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY : I hope before Whitsuntide.

BALLINAMORE CANAL.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) : I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether he can state the facts that led up to the seizure of the Ballinamore Canal ; whether there is any possibility of its redemption, considering that it forms an important link in the waterway from the north-western to the south-western counties of Ireland, and in whose hands it now is vested ; and, can he state the revenue, if any, derived from it ?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. R. W. Hanbury, Preston) : I regret that I cannot state the facts asked for, which led up to the seizure of this Canal—as it has never been seized. The facts as to its present abandoned condition, which are perhaps what the hon. Member desires to know, are these—It was finished in 1859 at a cost of £229,000. Of this sum the adjoining counties paid £30,000 and the remaining £199,000 was a free grant from the Exchequer. In 1860 it was handed over to local trustees. They advertised in vain for persons to establish boats upon it, and no use was made of it. Only five years later, in 1865, the Grand

Jury of County Cavan formally "expressed their unanimous sense of the utter inutility of this Navigation" and earnestly hoped that the Board of Works would not oblige them to maintain it as it "had been fully proved to be totally valueless to the County." From the first there was no traffic worth mentioning, and from 1865 it was allowed to go from bad to worse, until in 1882 the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Navigation between Coleraine, Belfast, and Limerick declared that it was in a condition of absolute uselessness. They reported that, while it would be useful as an arterial drain, it would, if restored, be of little benefit to the public for navigation, there would be no profitable traffic on it, and the local ratepayers would not support it. It is still in the hands of the local trustees, and of course no revenue is derived from the Navigation.

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): Was not that canal charged against Ireland?

MR. HANBURY: That is another question. I cannot answer it now.

POST OFFICE (LEWIS).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to fact that the Postmaster General notified on the 29th ultimo that the extension of telegraphic facilities carries with it the extension of money order and savings bank business, is he aware that while the offices at Bach, Balallan, Barvas, Crossbost, Garrabost, and Portnagurran, Island of Lewis, are open for the transaction of telegraph business, neither money order nor savings bank business is transacted at these offices; and, will he arrange for money order and savings bank business to be conducted at these offices at an early date?

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is aware that neither money order nor savings bank business is transacted at the offices in question. It is the fact that, as a general rule, post offices which are telegraph offices do transact money order and savings bank business; but there are many exceptions to this rule, and the offices named by the hon. Member are amongst the number. As he has already been informed by letter, the transaction of money order and savings bank business can be authorised if a separate guarantee in that respect is forthcoming.

STAMP ILLUSTRATIONS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General,(1) whether the Mulready stamp, the black penny stamp, and other postage stamps of the whole issues are still available for postage purposes; (2) whether, for some months past, the Postmaster General and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have insisted that stamp dealers and others shall desist from publishing miniature and other size illustrations of these stamps, in black or otherwise, in their catalogues; (3) whether it is within the knowledge of the authorities that an illustration of the Mulready stamp is being largely distributed by the promoters of the Philatelic Exhibition, of which the Postmaster General is one of the patrons; (4) whether such imitations or illustrations are contrary to the regulations specifically laid down by the Post Office permanent officials and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue; and, if so, why a special exception has been made in this particular case, whilst stringent regulations are made against illustrations brought out by English Stamp dealers; (5) whether he is aware that vast numbers of catalogues containing illustrations of English stamps made in Germany, come by post to this country, the sale of which are not, and cannot be, interfered with; and (6) whether the Post Office officials can point to any case in which fraud against the Post Office has arisen out of black illustrations of stamps which have appeared in the catalogues of English stamp dealers; and, if not, what is the reason of the present action of the Post Office?

MR. HANBURY: The answers to the first two paragraphs of the Question are in the affirmative. It became known to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue within the last few days, that an illustration of the Mulready stamp was being distributed as stated in the Question. The Postmaster General is a patron of the Philatelic Exhibition, but he was not consulted as to the issue of this imitation, and was not aware of its issue until informed of it by the Commissioners. He has informed them that he hopes no special exception will be made in favour of the Philatelic Exhibition. In preventing, as far as they can, the imitation of any postage stamps, whether of the United Kingdom, or of any colony or foreign country, the Postmaster General and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue (with whom the enforcements of the law rests) are governed by the reasons which led Parliament to pass the 7th Section of the Post Office Protection Act, 1884, and which led Her Majesty's Government to enter into Article XVIII. of the Universal Postal Union Convention of Vienna, 1891. Nothing, but certain legal doubts, removed by the decision of the High Court in "Dickens *v.* Gill" a year ago, have prevented a stricter enforcement of the law of which warning was given to all known stamp dealers by public notice in November 1885. In the opinion of the Postmaster General and Commissioners of Inland Revenue there is grave risk if dies capable of producing exact imitations of postage stamps in black and white are allowed to be used by unauthorised persons, and a foreign Government has more than once pressed this view upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government. It is the case that fictitious stamps and materials for making them are imported into this country. The Judges commented upon this in "Dickens *v.* Gill," and nothing but the want of a convenient opportunity for legislation has prevented the introduction of a clause to deal with the matter by amending the Customs Consolidation Act.

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury as representing the Postmaster General, whether, whereas under the Tweedmouth Report only two medical examinations were required for men on probation for appointment to sorterships, many who have already passed two examinations are now required to pass a third; and whether, if this be so, the Postmaster General will see his way to remove this obligation in the case of existing probationers?

Mr. HANBURY: The Tweedmouth Committee recommended that the probationary period of two years with three medical examinations should be reduced to one year with two medical examinations one at the beginning, and the other at the end of the period. Under the old system the intermediate examination was not quite so stringent as the other two, and the Postmaster General fears that it will not be possible to regard it as satisfying the requirements which the Tweedmouth Committee had in view. All concerned will, therefore, still have to undergo the final examination which is necessary before their appointments can be confirmed; but the probationers who have not passed the intermediate examination will of course be relieved from the obligation of undergoing it.

Mr. T. R. LEUTY (Leeds E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, has the Postmaster General considered the advisability of dispensing with guarantee from officers entitled to pension, as recommended by the Tweedmouth Committee; and, has the Post Office adopted the efficiency barrier, recommended by the Committee to be imposed when the wage is forty shillings, or is it likely that it will be adopted; if so, will the Postmaster General give imformation as to the nature of the barrier?

Mr. HANBURY: The question of these guarantees is under consideration, but the Postmaster General is not yet in a position to come to any decision. The efficiency bar referred to by the hon. Member has been adopted. The terms of the certificate under which an officer can pass that bar have been communicated to the heads of branches and surveyors; they are as follows:—

> "I certify that the officer named in the accompanying schedule is fully qualified to perform the highest duties of his class; that his attendance is regular, and that his conduct is in every respect satisfactory. There are no (or the following) official records of cases reported to head quarters against him."

EDUCATION CENTRE SUPERINTENDENTS (IRELAND.)

Mr. MICHAEL FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that on application to the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Board only four copies could be obtained of a Return giving the names of centre superintendents; and whether, owing to the importance of the Return, as is shown by several hon. Members applying for the same, the Return will be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The only application made to the Commissioners of Intermediate Education for copies of the Return in question was that made by the hon. Member himself, who, I am informed, was supplied with four copies, all they had to spare at the time. The Return is not considered to be of sufficient importance to lay on the Table as a Parliamentary Paper, but I have no doubt the Commissioners, if application be made to them by other hon. Members for copies of the Return, will be prepared to procure an additional supply.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

CAPTAIN CHALONER (Wilts, Westbury): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can see his way to grant special passes to Members of the House of Commons on Jubilee Day, to enable them to obtain access to their stands without having to start at an unreasonable hour in the morning?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The Question of my hon. and gallant Friend should properly have been addressed to the Home Secretary, who has desired me to say that no special passes will be given, but the police will have instructions to facilitate the passage of all those holding tickets for the House of Commons stand to their seats. Due notice will be given as to the hour at which all persons must be in their places.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the many interests represented in the cycling world, the Government will grant facilities for a monster Diamond Jubilee Cycle Demonstration, organised by the Cyclists' Parliamentary and Municipal Association, to be held in Hyde Park on Saturday 19th June; and whether, on that occasion, police could be placed on duty for the better maintenance of order along the route?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will allow me to answer this Question as it affects the Royal parks. A similar request was made to and declined by me some weeks ago. I regret that I cannot reconsider the matter, and must again refuse to authorise such a demonstration in Hyde Park.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, among the Members of the Colonial Services for whom seats are to be provided to view the Procession on Jubilee Day, any provision will be made for Members of the Indian Civil and Military Services?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have promised to place at the disposal of the India Office as many seats as can fairly be allotted to that Department, and, further, to find if possible some seats for the services specially alluded to by my hon. Friend. The distribution of tickets will be made by the authorities of the India Office.

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if, in view of the impracticability of obtaining anything like a full attendance of children at public elementary schools during the school week ending 25th June 1897, of the consequent loss in grants payable on average attendance, and of the risk of not fulfilling the minimum number of school openings required by the code if schools be closed during the said week as well as during the customary vacations of the year, he is now in a position to intimate that in the opinion of the Committee of Council the week ending 25th June ought to be made a children's holiday, and that for school years which include that week the minimum number of school openings required as a condition of the grants will be 390 and not 400?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Committee of Council will leave the matter to the discretion of the managers. There will, in ordinary cases, be no difficulty in making up the 400 openings required.

KASSALA.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when he will be able to make any statement to the House with regard to negotiations with Italy as to the occupation of Kassala by Egypt?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The Italian Government, who have acted with the utmost friendliness and consideration, have informed Her Majesty's Government that they do not desire to maintain their occupation of Kassala, but are anxious to consult the convenience of the British and Egyptian Governments as to the period of withdrawal. Her Majesty's Government have expressed their cordial acknowledgments, and the matter remains under discussion between the two Governments.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (MODEL SCHOOLS, IRELAND).

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Queen's Birthday, the 24th May, will be observed as a holiday in the Model Schools in Munster and throughout Ireland?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The reply to this Question is in the affirmative.

EVICTION (DURNASCALLON, COUNTY DERRY).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the circumstances which led to the eviction of James O'Neill, of Durnascallon, Desertmartin, Co. Derry, in January 1896; whether he is aware that O'Neill has applied under the Land Act of last Session to the Land Commission to use their good offices as mediators between O'Neill and his landlord with a view to his reinstatement; and whether the Land Commission took any steps to bring about the reinstatement of O'Neill; and, if so, with what result?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: O'Neill was evicted after the 1st January 1896, and the Land Commissioners have no power, therefore, to proceed with his application. The provisions of Section 47 of the Land Act of last year would only apply if the eviction had taken place before the 1st January 1896.

HONITON NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Department has received a complaint from parents of scholars in the Honiton National School that on the 12th ultimo their children were without their knowledge taken with the other scholars to a service in St. Paul's Church, the service being held during the time allotted to religious instruction, and such parents having desired the withdrawal of their children from such instruction; and whether the Department will take steps to prevent the recurrence of a similar proceeding?

SIR J. GORST: Complaints have been received from two parents, and the Committee of Council are at present in communication with the managers of the school.

SCHOOL BOARDS (LOANS).

MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education how much of the sum of £16,522,393 stated in the Education Report for 1895–96 to have been borrowed by School Boards from the Public Works Loan Commissioners had been repaid, such information having been given in previous Reports; and whether the Department will give similar information in the Report for 1896–97?

SIR J. GORST: The amount actually borrowed from the Public Works Loan Commissioners was £17,940,913, of which £6,167,567 has been repaid. The information was omitted because misleading, a large portion of the repayments being met by re-borrowing.

MACROOM GUARDIANS (REMOVAL OF SICK PAUPERS).

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork Co., S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the case of a pauper named Jeremiah Donovan, who having been a paralytic inmate of the Macroom Workhouse for eight years, was recently transferred to Clonakilty by car and rail in a most feeble and destitute condition at the expense of the Macroom Guardians; whether he is aware that the Macroom Guardians provided him with a new suit of clothes, a car to Bandon, and money for the journey, and that a relieving officer of the Clonakilty Union found it necessary to take him to hospital on his arrival at Clonakilty; and whether such transference by and at the expense of the Macroom Guardians is legal; and if not what steps will be taken to relieve the Clonakilty Union of the expense incurred in the maintenance of this pauper pending his removal to Macroom workhouse?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention had not been previously directed to the circumstances attending the removal of Donovan from the Macroom workhouse. With the view of ascertaining the actual facts of the case, the Local Government Board's Inspector for the district has been instructed to hold an Inquiry, and the result of his investigation will be communicated to me in due course.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is great need for labourers' cottages in the village and townland of Kilmanagh, in the Callan Union, and that the applications of two labourers in Kilmanagh named Walsh and Fitzgerald were refused by the Local Government Board inspector first on the grounds that two other cottages built by the union were not occupied for some time after the erection, and secondly that Walsh and Fitzgerald were unmarried; whether these are valid reasons for refusing to erect cottages where they are wanted; whether he is aware that in other parts of the Callan Union cottages have been erected for unmarried labourers, and that cottages are often left unoccupied for a considerable time after erection, especially in winter, to allow them to dry before being tenanted; and whether he will see that Walsh and Fitzgerald are provided with cottages?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: On the 29th March last I replied to a somewhat similar question addressed to me by the hon. Member, and to that reply I have nothing to add, except that it is not intended to alter the decision already arrived at by the Local Government Board after careful local inquiry by their inspectors.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is great need for labourers' cottages in the Draperstown and Baneran divisions of the Magherafelt Union; whether an inquiry was held by the Local Government Board, and a scheme for the erection of a number of cottages in these divisions sanctioned; and whether he will explain the delay in having them erected, or say when the work of building will commence, and how many houses it is intended to erect?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A Provisional Order was issued by the Local Government Board, after due local inquiry, authorising the erection of three cottages in the Baneran electoral division and two cottages in the Draperstown division. The solicitor acting for the Board of Guardians explains that the delay in erecting the cottages has been caused by the difficulty experienced in procuring titles to the lands to be acquired and also in arranging with the Land Commission, who have charge of the lands, as to the payment of the purchase money. The matter appears, however, to be now approaching completion and further delay is not anticipated.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that an application for a cottage under the Labourers' Act in the electoral division of Feddyglass, in the Union of Strabane, was lodged three years ago by Samuel Brown, and that the cottage in which Brown lives has been condemned by the inspector of the Local Government Board; and (2) will he explain why his application for a cottage has been refused?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The reason why this man Brown's application has been refused is that he is a road contractor, and as such does not come within the provisions of the Labourers' Acts.

MR. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he state how much remains unused at the Treasury of the sum that should have been devoted for the purpose of erecting labourers' cottages in Ireland. Will he explain why fewer labourers' cottages have been built in Ulster than in any other part of Ireland; and what course he intends to take with regard to Boards of Guardians in Ulster who have not yet erected labourers' cottages?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The amount unexpended on account of labourers' cottages in Ireland is £11,963. The reasons why the Labourers' Acts have not been utilised in Ulster to the same extent as in other parts of Ireland are that fewer applications for labourers cottages have been made by labourers in the province, and that the boards of guardians there are more unwilling to admit the necessity for providing cottages under the Acts. If any cases of default on the part of a board of guardians in Ulster to put the Labourers Acts into operation are brought before the Local Government Board they will, as they have hitherto done, at once cause inquiry to be made into the merits of such cases, and, if necessary, empower their inspectors to carry out the provisions of the Acts.

TELEGRAPH OFFICE (BALCARRA, CO. MAYO).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that there is a great want for a telegraph office in Balcarra, County Mayo; and whether he proposes to take steps towards the establishment of such an office?

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster-General has not received any application for a telegraph office in Balcarra, County Mayo. He will be glad to make inquiry on the subject, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

LLANGOLLEN SCHOOL BOARD.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (1) whether his attention has been drawn to the action of the Llangollen School Board in reference to the acquisition of land for a playground; (2) whether he is aware that in consequence of frequent complaints from Her Majesty's Inspector the school board in question presented a petition in 1895 to the Education Department praying for a provisional order to enable them to acquire certain land under the Land Clauses Consolidation Acts, and whether after a local inquiry the Education Department issued a Provisional Order and that it was confirmed by Parliament; (3) whether he is aware that the school board delayed carrying out the Provisional Order, and that they received in July 1896 imperative instructions from the Educational Department to acquire the land in respect to which they had obtained the Provisional Order; and the school board then asked for the sanction of the Education Department to buy a smaller quantity of land than what was specifically mentioned in the schedule of the Provisional Order, and that the Department replied in September 1896 that they must require the purchase of the whole of the land referred to; (4) will he explain why in March last the Education Department took another view of the situation and sanctioned the purchase of the lesser quantity of land; and (5) whether such an alteration in the terms of a Provisional Order, confirmed by Parliament, can be sanctioned without an amending Order?

SIR J. GORST: The facts are as stated. The consent referred to in the fourth paragraph was subject to the Board's being able legally to effect the purchase of a portion only of the land scheduled in the Provisional Order. The last paragraph is a question of law, which the Committee of Council have no authority to determine.

POLLEN ACT (LOUGH NEAGH).

MR. P. C. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that distress and dissatisfaction subsist amongst the Lough Neagh fishermen, owing to the pecuniary loss which is inflicted upon them by the operation of the "Pollen Act," which precludes them from selling fish under eight inches in length; whether he is aware that a special meeting was held on 6th March last and reported that in the opinion of the Board of Conservators no reason exists why fishermen should not be permitted to dispose of pollen of not less than seven inches, which may legally be killed by their legal nets; and what steps, if any, will be taken to give effect to the special report of the Board of Conservators to remove the grievance of the Lough Neagh fishermen by allowing them to sell pollen from seven inches in length upwards, instead of throwing them aside to rot as they are obliged to do now under the present state of the law?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: On the 1st February last I stated in answer to a question put by the hon. Member that experiments had been made with a view of ascertaining the condition of pollen less than 8 inches in length, and that apart altogether from the consideration whether fish of less than that length would be useful as marketable commodity, the results of the experiments showed clearly that to reduce the size limit would be injurious to the pollen fisheries. The Pollen Act was passed in consequence of the enormous destruction of small and immature fish. The capture of a number of seven-inch fish is due to the fact that when the net is being drawn, the meshes become strained, and even if the mesh were smaller so as to allow for the legal capture of seven-inch fish, a number of six-inch fish would, for the same reason, be captured. Upon the information at present before me, I see no reason for an amendment of the existing law.

Mr. DILLON: As fishing is allowed would it not be better to allow the sale?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have already given all the information I have.

CHARGE OF MURDER (OMAGH).

Mr. VESEY KNOX (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland (1) whether he is aware that two young men named Maguire were tried at last Summer Assizes on a charge of murder when the jury disagreed, and again at the Winter Assizes in Belfast when the jury acquitted them; that they were again tried at Omagh Spring Assizes on a charge of larceny of money from the dead body on practically the same evidence when the jury disagreed; (2) whether they are still in prison awaiting a fourth trial, and for how long have they already been imprisoned; and (3) whether, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, the Crown will proceed further against them?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. J. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): The facts stated in the first part of the question are substantially accurate, save that the accused were last tried on two charges, one for the robbery of Triston when alive, and the other for robbery from his dead body. It is quite true that all the facts relied upon to establish the case of robbery were given in evidence on the trial for murder, but the main defence of the prisoners on that occasion was that the deceased was not murdered, but died from natural causes. Though the only available evidence therefore might have been insufficient to prove a case of murder, this portion of it may be conclusive on the charge of robbery. The prisoners have been in custody since the 6th of March, 1896, and are now awaiting a second trial for the offence of robbery, with which, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the charge of tbe learned judge who presided at the at the last trial, it is intended to proceed.

QUEEN'S COLLEGES (IRELAND).

Mr. J. PINKERTON (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether his attention has been directed to the Ministerial pledges given at the foundation of the Queen's Colleges, to the effect that the patronage of the Crown would be exercised to secure, if possible, the services of Roman Catholic professors and office-bearers in Galway and Cork and of Presbyterians in Belfast; (2) whether he is aware that the first President, Vice President, and office-bearers in Galway were exclusively Roman Catholic, but that at present the President and office-bearers are now exclusively Protestants; and (3) whether any steps will be taken to redeem the pledges referred to?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am unable to find in the Ministerial statements made at the time when the establishment of the Queen's Colleges was under discussion, any pledge to the effect mentioned in the Question. I have no information regarding the statements in the second paragraph, though I am making inquiries.

MR. PINKERTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that no effect has been given to the pledges?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no information.

MR. W. JOHNSTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these colleges are banned by the Roman Catholic hierarchy?

[No answer was given.]

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that, out of the 4,324,000 withdrawals estimated to have been made from the Post Office Savings Bank during the year 1896, only 25,000 are estimated to have been made to third persons, will he state whether it has been found necessary to make arrangements so that money withdrawn by telegraph may be paid to a third person; and, if such arrangements have been made, will he state to what extent money withdrawn by telegraph has been paid to third persons?

MR. HANBURY: Money withdrawn from the Savings Bank by telegraph can be paid to a third person in the same way as money withdrawn by the ordinary means. No separate record is kept of such cases and the Postmaster General cannot, therefore, state to what extent money withdrawn by telegraph has been paid to third persons.

PUBLICAN'S LICENCE (IRELAND)

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) what ground there is for the allegation that a licensed publican, named Jolly, refused the use of his post car to the police of Tempo, on the night of 28th August 1896, when, during a dangerous riot, they demanded the use of the vehicle to send for assistance to a neighbouring station; (2) has the refusal by publicans in recent years to give their cars for the conveyance of police and emergency men to evictions been made the grounds of objection to the renewal of the said publican's licences; and (3) did the police of Tempo oppose Mr. Jolly's licence for refusing them the use of his car at a time when life and property were in danger?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The allegation referred to in the first paragraph is founded on fact, though the demand for the car was made not by the police personally, but by the barrack servant. There have been many cases in which the police opposed the renewal of publicans' licences throughout Ireland under the circumstances mentioned in the second paragraph, but I do not think there have been any such cases in recent years, as the necessity for action on the part of the police has not arisen. The police did not oppose the renewal of Mr. Jolly's licence, because it was doubtful whether the objection could be sustained, in view of the fact that the demand for the car was made, as I have stated, not by the police but by the barrack servant.

SUPPLY (ORDNANCE FACTORY VOTE).

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office when the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the question of Superannuation will report; and, whether the Report will be published before the Ordnance Factory Vote is discussed?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): The investigation is being made by certain officials of the Department, but it is of a confidential character and their report will not be published. They hope to conclude their inquiry within a month. It involves other Departments than the War Office.

INDIAN MIDLAND AND BENGAL-NAGPUR RAILWAYS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India will he explain under what circumstances a portion of the interest charges in connection with the Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpur Railways have now for some years been met out of the Famine Insurance Fund, in view of the fact that shortly after the creation of the Famine Insurance Fund the Government of India requested the sanction of the Secretary of State to meet certain interest charges in connection with protective railways from the fund; that Lord Cranbrook, the then Secretary of State, withheld his sanction on the ground that such a step would be a complete inversion of the object with which the fund was constituted; and that this decision was upheld by two Parliamentary Committees sitting in 1879 and 1884 respectively?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The general policy of the Government is that to which the hon. Member refers as having been supported by the Committees of 1879 and 1884—namely, that money shall be borrowed for such railways only as are likely to be so productive that the net receipts will cover the charge interest on the debt incurred, and that protective railways charged on the Famine Insurance Grant shall be constructed out of the revenue. In 1885, however, the Government of India found it necessary to undertake an exceptionally large scheme of railways, two of which were intended for the protection of the country against famine. The Secretary of State in Council held that the circumstances were of a special character, which could not have been contemplated by the Parliamentary Committees; and, as the Government could not themselves construct the whole of the works, and he was unwilling to delay the two urgently needed protective lines, he authorised their construction by companies, the interest being debited against the Famine Insurance Grant. When the lines came into operation, the receipts were set against the interest, and the net charge was so debited. I should add that the Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpur Railways traverse some of the worst famine districts, and without their distributing power it would have been impossible to have kept the people alive in those districts during the past months.

LAND COMMISSION.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the terms of reference to the proposed Royal Commission on the Irish Land Commission and the names of the Commissioners?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not yet in a position to made a statement on the subject.

MR. DILLON: Will he say when he is likely to be in a position to give the information?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot assign a day. The hon. Member is aware that these matters take time. There shall be no unnecessary delay.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether the Land Commission have adopted the practice of having fair rent applications heard and the holding inspected by only one lay Commissioner in some cases because of the want of a sufficient number of Assistant Commissioners; (2) will he explain why the Land Commission have not adopted the practice in all cases; and (3) whether the present staff of Assistant Commissioners is sufficiently numerous for the work to be done, or has any representation on the subject been made to the Irish Government or the Treasury?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In reply to the first paragraph of this Question, I have no doubt that the large number of applications is a factor in the case. The Commissioners, in the exercise of the discretion expressly invested in them by Act of Parliament, delegate the hearing of applications to one or two lay Assistant Commissioners as they they think fit. Some addition to the staff of Assistant Commissioners will shortly be made.

TURCO-GREEK WAR.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any information has reached him in reference to atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Turkish soldiery in Epirus?

*MR. CURZON: No such information has reached Her Majesty's Government. As I have previously stated it is not possible for Her Majesty's Government to have official information at first hand of incidents of the war, as they have no representative on the spot.

MR. DILLON: Are there no British Consuls in Epirus?

*MR. CURZON: Yes; but I do not think they have been at the scene of active operations.

CHARITY SCHEME (THORNTON-IN-CRAVEN.)

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE (Burnley): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Thirsk Division of Yorkshire whether the Charity Commissioners have decided that the Charity known as "Crowther's Charity," situated at Earby, in the parish of Thornton-in-Craven, is not a parochial charity; and if so what kind of charity they deem it to be, since the accounts of the said charity have been laid before three successive annual parish meetings, thereby complying with Section 14, Subsection 6, of the Local Government Act of 1894; and whether Section 5, Subsection 20, of the same Act applies to this charity?

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. J. GRANT LAWSON, York, N.R., Thirsk and Malton): Crowther's Charity is not in the view of the Charity Commissioners a parochial charity within the definition in the Local Government Act 1894, because its benefits are open to persons who shall at any time have resided within the parish of Thornton, and are not therefore confined to inhabitants of any single parish or otherwise, as required by that provision. The charity is, moreover, within the exemption created by Section 14 (8) of the same Act, having been founded within 40 years before the passing of the Act. The Commissioners therefore, deem the Charity to be modern and non-parochial. The Rector and Churchwardens are by the foundation the Trustees of the Charity, and Section 5 (2) (*c*) of the Act, to which provision it is presumed the Question refers does not, therefore, apply.

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Thirsk Division of Yorkshire whether the Charity Commissioners have arrived at a decision that the present is a suitable time for establishing Robert Windle's Free School upon a new scheme, seeing that the endowment is by foundation for a grammar school, whereas the annuity of £20 per annum is being appropriated and spent for the purpose of providing elementary education in the parish of Thornton-in-Craven; and whether it is the intention of the Charity Commissioners in their contemplated scheme to sell the said school and land connected therewith, and transfer the same when realised, together with the annuity, to some technical school or college there to be established as a scholarship?

MR. GRANT LAWSON: The Charity Commissioners do not think the present is a suitable time for making a scheme for this school. They are led to this view by the considerations mentioned in paragraph 34 of their annual Report for last year, the endowment being very small, the matter being one of some difficulty and apparently contentious, and more fit to be dealt with hereafter as part of a general system of secondary education in the district. Should a scheme eventually be made by the Commissioners it might be found necessary to adopt the course indicated in the last part of the Question.

TELEPHONE SERVICE (GLASGOW).

MR. FAITHFUL BEGG (Glasgow, St. Rollox): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury as representing the Postmaster General if he can now state the exact form of inquiry which will be held in Glasgow in connection with the request of the Corporation for a telephone licence, and their complaint regarding inefficient service against the National Telephone Company; and when the inquiry will be held?

MR. HANBURY: As the Glasgow Corporation now appear to think an inquiry unnecessary, it is, of course, also unnecessary to state more than I have already stated a few days ago, namely, that the Government were willing to agree to a public independent inquiry into the complaints made by the Corporation.

MOHILL BURIAL GROUND (CO. LEITRIM).

MR. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been directed by the Mohill Board of Guardians to the action of the select vestry in desecrating the graves of the Catholics buried in the Mohill graveyard, South Leitrim, by employing men to level the graves and cart away the crosses and headstones; what action, if any, has been taken by the Local Government Board in the matter; and whether he is aware that a number of policemen were engaged in preventing the relatives of the deceased from entering the graveyard to examine the desecrated graves, and by whose authority the police were directed to pursue this course?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The attention of the Local Government Board has been directed by the Guardians to the removal of tombstones and other marks from the burial ground at Mohill. The Board have informed the Guardians that the case was not one in which the Board had legal authority to interfere, and have suggested that the parties aggrieved by the action of the churchwardens should be guided by legal advice as to the proper mode of procedure. I understand that the burial ground is vested in the Representative Church body, and it appears to me that the parties aggrieved might usefully place themselves in communication with that body. With regard to the last paragraph, I am informed that the action of the police, who promptly reported the occurrences referred to, has been strictly confined to the preservation of the public peace.

POST OFFICE (DUNDALK).

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, how long the question of providing a new post office for Dundalk has been before the Department; whether another eligible site was recently brought before the Postal authorities; and, is there any intention of providing the long promised improvement in regard to this office during the present Administration?

Mr. HANBURY: The question of a new post office at Dundalk has been before the Department since 1893, but such sites or premises as would otherwise have been suitable could not be obtained at a reasonable cost. The necessity for a new post office at Dundalk is admitted, and for some time past endeavours have been made to obtain a suitable site or premises at a reasonable cost, but hitherto without success. A scheme, however, which apparently promises a satisfactory result, is now under consideration. The question has not yet been laid before the Treasury.

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Mr. G. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) has his attention been called to the fact that the Irish fishing industry is in a very unsatisfactory condition, as shown by the return relating to the sea fisheries, lately published by the Board of Trade; (2) whether he is aware that the chief cause of the decline of this industry is due to the fact that the small Irish boats are obliged to fish near home as they can neither follow the fish to their constantly changing feeding grounds, nor when a good catch is made can it be taken to the best market; that the resources of the Irish sea fisheries remain undeveloped for want of capital; and that the number of first-class Irish boats, though always small, diminishes year by year; and (3) in view of the grave interests involved will the Government make a grant to encourage and build up this decaying industry?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: It is not correct to describe the Irish sea fisheries as being a declining industry. The Board of Trade return mentions that the quantity of fish landed on the Irish coasts in 1896 was 843,062 cwt., but explains that these figures are subject to alteration. I have now ascertained that the correct figures for 1896, which were not available when the return was published, are 986,692 cwt. These figures show an increase over former years, amounting to 41 per cent. over the quantity landed in 1895, and to 62 per cent. as compared with 1892. With regard to the number of boats employed, it is true there has been a slight decrease in the number of first-class boats, but if boats of the first, second, and third classes be taken into account it will be seen that there has been no diminution in the aggregate. In reference to the last paragraph, the hon. Member has overlooked the fact that a considerable sum of money has been expended by the Congested Districts Board on fishery schemes. The steps taken by the Board to promote the Irish fisheries are fully detailed in their various published reports, and a reference to the last report will show that down to March 31st, 1896, the total expenditure on fishery schemes amounted to £53,290.

DOG MUZZLING.

MR. J. W. LOGAN (Leicester, Harborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Board of Agriculture proposes to extend the Muzzling Order to the County of Leicester, with the exception of the petty sessional division of Belvoir: and if he will inform the House why, if the order is necessary in the county at all, a small portion of it should be exempted?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): A Muzzling Order applicable to the County of Leicester, with the exception of the petty sessional division of Belvoir, was made on the 11th inst. We did not think it necessary to include the petty sessional division of Belvoir, inasmuch as its geographical position in relation to the rest of the county, and the fact that it is comparatively remote from any recent case of rabies, led us to conclude that it cannot at the present time be regarded as a dangerous area.

CRETE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the Admirals at Crete have decided not to request the Turkish troops to leave the island until the insurgents have laid down their arms?

MR. CURZON: No such decision has been taken by the Admirals.

LETTERBREEN PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland will he cause inquiry to be made into the circumstances under which the election for the Petty Sessions District of Letterbreen, county Fermanagh, held in January last after due advertisement, has been annulled by the Irish Government, on the allegation that the advertisement was bad, and a new advertisement and summons have been issued for another election on the 25th instant; and will he state wherein the first advertisement was bad, and if it is legally competent for the Irish Government to so change the old form of summons, by the new advertisement issued in April last, as wholly to alter the conditions for the election in this case?

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: I am quite familiar with the particulars of the case, so that all further inquiry is unnecessary. The election was annulled because it was informal and irregular. A new advertisement has been issued and a fresh election is about to take place. The first advertisement omitted to state that an exception to the limit of age was made in favour of persons already acting as Petty Sessions clerks. It is in my opinion perfectly competent for the Government to take the course they did, namely, to annul the election and state expressly in the advertisement for the new election this exemption in favour of persons already holding the office of Petty Sessions clerks in another district, which it has been always the custom to act upon.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

MR. H. SETON-KARR (St. Helens): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the new and important principles and the wide-reaching effect of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, and the great number of men and large amount of invested capital affected thereby, the Government will postpone the Committee stage of the said Bill to a later date, in order that adequate time may be given to those affected thereby to fully and carefully consider the provisions of the Bill?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I understand my hon. Friend's Question is as to whether the Committee stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill can be deferred from Monday. This is really more a question for the House than for the Government to determine. The Government desire to meet the convenience of the House. I am extremely anxious that the Committee stage should be taken at the very earliest date—[*cheers*]—and I can hardly believe that any serious inconvenience will be inflicted upon any trade or any interest by taking it on Monday. If it be deferred I am afraid it may greatly interfere with the comfort of the House in connection with the Whitsuntide holidays, and I should be very sorry to bring back hon. Members for very important business on the Monday following Whit Monday. At present my idea would be that the House should indeed meet on the Monday following Whit Monday, and that during that week we should as far as possible take business of a wholly uncontroversial character—Supply, or largely Supply—and that the majority of Members need not, therefore, curtail their holidays. Of course, if we do not make much progress, if we do not finish the Committee stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, or, at all events, make so great progress that the end was within very measurable distance, I am afraid I shall have to ask the House to take that Bill in that week, which I do not think would be very convenient to hon. Members. I hope, therefore, that Members who have amendments to put down will do what, I am sure, they can do if they exert themselves—that is, frame their amendments in time for discussion in the House on Monday and following days.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Notts, Rushcliffe): Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman proposes to ask the House to reassemble for some business on the Monday after Whit Monday?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: As far as I can foresee from the progress of public business, that will probably be the best course.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Is that final?

MR. SETON-KARR: May I ask whether, in the event of the right hon. Gentleman receiving representations that individual industries which are seriously affected by the Bill desire longer time to consider their amendments to that Bill, he will postpone the Committee stage?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: It is difficult to answer that question. I would point out to my hon. Friend that in any case there will be a Report stage for anything that is omitted in Committee. I still think that the general convenience of the House should be considered in this matter, and I cannot easily imagine the sort of amendment it would be impossible to construct before Monday. ["Hear, hear"!]

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, having regard to the statement made by the engineer of Port Ness Harbour works that the huge concrete blocks which fell into the harbour have not been removed owing to the weather not being suitable and that the blocks are not a source of danger to the fishermen, will he take steps to obtain information from the fishermen who are compelled to use the harbour?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement I made to the hon. Member last Thursday from the report of the engineer of the works, but if any authoritative representation in writing be made to the Secretary for Scotland by the fishermen on the subject he will give it his consideration.

MR. WEIR asked whether Messrs. Stevens and Co., Edinburgh, were the engineers for the harbour in question?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: Yes, Sir.

COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE (EUROPEAN AND INDIAN OFFICIALS).

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the fact that the salaries of the European officials in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hong Kong are paid in silver currency, will he state whether any compensation allowance has been granted to them for the depreciation of silver, as has been granted by the Government of India to its European employés?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN Birmingham, W.): European officials in Ceylon are at present paid half their salaries at 1s. 6d. the rupee, and in Straits Settlements and Hong Kong at 3s. to the dollar.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Comptroller and Auditor General to the Government of India raised any objection to the payment of compensation allowance to the 40 Indian officials whose salaries are by statute fixed in rupees; and whether he took any steps to stop these payments and surcharge the officers concerned; if so, upon what grounds have these payments been continued for nearly four years?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Doubts as to the technical legality of the payment of exchange compensation allowance to the officers whose salaries are fixed under statute in rupees were raised, not by the Comptroller and Auditor General himself, but on two separate occasions by two of his accounting officers. The result of the doubts thus raised was a reference by the Government of India to the Secretary of State in Council; and as I have already informed the hon. Member, the matter is still under my consideration, with a view to the procuring of further legal opinions. The payments have hitherto been made in India under the impression, confirmed by legal advice, that they were not only equitable but legal, and until the question is finally decided it is obvious that no steps of any kind can be taken.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT.

MR. J. W. SIDEBOTHAM (Cheshire, Hyde): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether Voluntary Schools are exempt from rates from the date on which the Voluntary Schools Act received the Royal Assent, 8th April; and whether in the case of a rate levied on 1st April, a Voluntary School would be liable for the whole half-year's rate, or for one week's proportion only?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): In my opinion the liability is complete as soon as the rate is levied, and in the case put by my hon. Friend the school is liable for the whole amount of the rate levied on April 1.

STATUTE LAW REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether any record is kept of the proceedings of the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament on Statute Law Revision Bills and Consolidation Bills; and, if so, whether such record has been, or will be, presented to either House?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Minutes of Proceedings of the Joint Committee on Statute Law Revision and Consolidation Bills are reported to the House and then printed, when the Committee makes it first Report.

LAND RATING (IRELAND).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he expects to be in a position to make any statement on the subject of Irish rating and the relief grant to be applied to Ireland under the Land Rating Act of last year?

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, after the almost unanimous vote of Irish Members that was given on Thursday night, that the money that had been allocated to Ireland in 1896 should go to the relief of rates, it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill and the Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill, under which this money would be allocated to other purposes; and, if not, whether the Government are prepared to reconsider the position taken up on Thursday night, and make provision for the reduction of agricultural local rates in Ireland on the same basis as has already taken place in England and Scotland?

MR. KNOX: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the strong condemnation by the Press of all parties of the Government's refusal to give to Irish agricultural ratepayers the same relief as has already been given to English ratepayers, the Government will still persist in refusing equal treatment to Irish farmers?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: In reference to these Questions, I have to say that I hope to make a statement in connection with Irish business to-morrow at Question time.

INDIA (EXPENDITURE).

MR. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is any likelihood of the Royal Commission on the Expenditure of India completing their Report before the end of the present Session; and, whether, in that case, he will give special facilities for a Debate on the Report, apart from the usual discussion of the Indian Budget?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I understand there is little chance of the Report being issued in time to permit of its proper consideration by the Government before the close of the Session.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL.

General RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government have come to any decision respecting the introduction of a Manœuvres Bill this Session, so as to allow for arrangements being made in good time to permit manœuvres on an extended scale being practised next year?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I think it would be desirable to introduce this Bill in its new and, I hope, more acceptable form in the course of the present Session. Whether it will be possible to make any progress with it, will depend upon the reception it meets with. I could not promise any important fraction of Parliamentary time for its discussion.

WHITSUNTIDE HOLIDAYS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he can conveniently state to the House when the Whitsuntide holidays will begin?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: As I think I have already intimated, in answer to a previous question, we shall probably rise on the Friday before Whit Sunday.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: Will there be a Morning Sitting on that Friday?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: No, Sir.

Mr. HENRY LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would tell them what was in his mind in respect to Whitsuntide? [*Laughter.*] He did not quite gather what holidays they were going to have.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I thought I had already informed the House that much will depend on the progress we make with the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill. We rise on the Friday before Whit Monday. If we have either finished the Committee stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, or, as I have said, made such material progress with it that the completion of the Committee stage is obviously not a matter of any lengthened discussion, I shall then propose that the House should meet on the Monday after Whit Monday—the 14th of June. On the Monday, Thursday, and Friday, which are the only three days remaining to the Government in that week, Supply will be taken, and I shall do my best to make it of as uncontroversial a character as possible. That would enable hon. Gentlemen who are not interested in the particular Supply taken to prolong their absence from the House until the Monday following. The House would still be in Session, and I should again take Supply. That would be the Monday before the Jubilee Celebration. We shall adjourn from the Monday to the Thursday after the Jubilee Celebration. The House will see that, if that arrangement be carried out, a very large proportion of the House will not be burdened by attendance within these walls during a considerable time before the Jubilee Celebration. But the possibility of carrying out this arrangement depends on the progress we succeed in making before the Whitsuntide holidays with the Accidents Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Will the right hon. gentleman say, on the supposition that the Second Reading of the Finance Bill will be taken to-night, when the Committee stage will be put down?

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: It must be some time after Whitsuntide.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Under the scheme he has laid down to hand over Wednesday, the 16th, to private legislation, including a Female Suffrage Bill. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. LOUGH asked whether, if the favourable progress which the First Lord of the Treasury anticipated was made, it might not be possible to meet on the Thursday week after Whit Monday. [*General cheers.*]

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: If the House showed any great enthusiasm for the transaction of public business, I would not say that such a plan would be absolutely impossible. [*Cheers.*]

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICE VOTES).

Mr. KNOX asked the Secretary to the Treasury the order in which the Irish Votes would be taken to-morrow.

MR. HANBURY said the votes for the Local Government Board and criminal prosecutions would be taken first. The votes in Class 2 would be taken in order, but those for the Chief Secretary, the Public Works Board, and Education would be postponed.

DUNGARVAN AND LISMORE RAILWAY.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury if he could make any statement with regard to the negotiations which were pending between the Treasury and the Dungarvan and Lismore Railway.

MR. HANBURY said he had already told the hon. Member that they were confidential, and until a result was arrived at he could not make any statement. All he could say was that it would be arrived at before the Public Works Vote was taken.

PRISONS BILL.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool) in asking leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to prisons, said this was an important measure embodying certain amendments which had been under discussion both in the House and in the country, and which, he need hardly remind the House, were the result of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Leeds. He could not expect to make substantial progress with the measure this Session, but he was very anxious that the House and the country should be in possession of his proposal. [" Hear, hear!"] He might say that he should couple with the Bill a memorandum explaining its objects.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Matthew White Ridley and Mr. Jesse Collings; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 262.]

THE POLICE AND STOLEN PROPERTY.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY also asked leave to introduce a Bill to make further provision with respect to the disposal of property in the possession of the police. He said this was a small Bill which had been made necessary by the observations of the Comptroller and Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee with reference to certain property found in the possession of prisoners which, under the present law, could not be satisfactorily disposed of. Under the present law, property found in the possession of a prisoner could not be legally disposed of and restored to its owner or otherwise dealt with if it exceeded £15 in value, and was not charged to have been stolen. Consequently, a large fund had been accumulated in the hands of the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police, and the Comptroller and Auditor General having called attention to this matter before the Public Accounts Committee, the authorities had been bound to take action. As the result of a Departmental Committee certain proposals were made which had been embodied in this Bill. The object of the Bill was to enable the Court to restore such property to its rightful owner, if such owner could be found, of whatever value, and, further, to enable the police to dispose of the property and to use the proceeds for certain objects specified in the Bill if the proper owner could not be found. It also provided for a satisfactory audit, and he might add that, as far as he was aware, the proposals for the audit had the consent of the Comptroller and Auditor General.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Matthew White Ridley and Mr. Jesse Collings; presented accordingly and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 263.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

On the Motion for the Third Reading of this Bill,

Mr. JOHN HUTTON (York, N.R., Richmond) said he desired to enter an earnest protest against the working of the Bill with regard to small rural School Boards. In the Division he represented there were no fewer than 110 elementary schools. Of these only 15 were Board Schools. Some of them were of the very poorest class in the whole country—nine of them had an average attendance of under 50—and not one of the 15 received a single shilling under the Bill. [*Opposition cheers.*] He should like to illustrate these schools by quoting the state of one particular school. It was in a school district situated on the moor edges, seven miles from the nearest railway station. The population at the present time was only 223, and the rateable value only £3,810. In 1876 the district was compelled to form a School Board, and built two schools—the population being more than double the present number—one to hold 70 children, the other 40. The closing of the mines caused almost the entire population to disappear, and the average attendance at those schools was now only 21 and 19. A school rate of 9d. was necessary, and the cost per child was no less than £5. 19s. 9d. He inquired whether it was possible to move an Amendment in Committee, so as to bring these Board Schools within the Bill, but was informed on the highest authority that it could not be done without also bringing in the schools in the rich towns such as London and other large cities. He was aware that the Agricultural Rating Bill of last year gave some relief to such poor districts as he had referred to; but it was relief to occupiers of land only, and was not of the slightest help to occupiers of houses as such. That, he thought, was a very great grievance of which they had a right to complain. When the Voluntary Schools Bill was passing through the House they were told again and again that the poor Board Schools would be relieved by another Bill. He had already said that the poor School Board districts in the constituency he represented must be among the poorest in the whole country, and it was a great injustice and a real grievance that they should be left out in the cold. He only hoped that his right hon. Friend the head of the Education Department would see his way to promise that in a future Session he would bring in some Bill to give substantial relief to the schools to which he had referred.

*Mr. R. W. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said he was of opinion that the fond hopes of the last speaker would not be fulfilled. Seeing that it was the declared intention of leading men on the Ministerial Benches to crush out rather than encourage Board Schools, it was not likely that the poor districts he so ably represented would get any such help as he asked for. He should not like the Bill to pass without offering his protest against its injustice. ["Hear, hear!"] It was unjust to numerous classes in the country, and the principle upon which it was based was absolutely unintelligible. Many of the great towns which bore the main burden of the assistance given under the Voluntary Schools Act, and who would have also to bear the main part of the burden under this so-called Necessitous Schools Bill, had no relief whatever, and had no share, the bulk of them, in this petty and miserable educational dole. [*Opposition cheers.*] The great cities of Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Birmingham, Bradford, Bristol, Cardiff, and London herself, had no share whatever, although the ratepayers were burdening themselves far more for educational work than the voluntary subscribers in rural districts and towns where the sectarian schools were now in operation. There was a further great injustice as between town and country. One would have imagined that when this small solatium—a sort of educational hush-money to the School Boards—was offered by the Education Department—a sort of conscience-money, he supposed, given in fulfilment of a pledge to do something for the Board Schools which they could not well get out of—one would have thought that when they came to distribute this small bounty, they would have exercised some ingenuity in trying to distribute it on some equitable footing as between town and country. What was the position in reference to this small grant of £110,000? There were in this country some 5,400 Board Schools. Yet, about one-third of the money distributable under the Bill went to nine towns or School Board districts. Leeds got the enormous sum of £6,788—money which would be far more justly distributed in the rural districts of Yorkshire; Hull got £1,868, and the town of Sheffield got close on £3,000. Nottingham, another very flourishing town, received close on £4,000; and Leicester £3,377. But the biggest haul was made by the district comprising West Ham, Wanstead, Walthamstow, and Leyton, which got no less than £17,500 out of this £110,000. Now was that equitable? Did it commend itself to any man of common sense? They might point to the Bill, and say that they had adopted the principle of contributing the difference between the produce of a 3d. rate and the limit of 16s. 6d. per head. But common-sense men would judge by the results. The reason why these alleged poverty-stricken districts of West Ham and the neighbourhood received this enormous bounty was due very largely to the fact that the rateable value of property there was extremely low. The standard of rateable value, he contended, was no fair index of the poverty of a district. His point was, that an enormous proportion of this money went to the towns as against the villages and rural districts. In the county of Lincoln, in the Division he represented, covering an area of over one thousand square miles, they had 175 villages, with two or three small towns, and they had something like twenty School Boards. In the whole county there were 107 School Boards. It was the custom to represent the rural districts as wholly given over to Anglican educational control. That, he was thankful to say, was not absolutely the case. It was true there were 8,000 villages in which there was only one sectarian school, and that a school of the Anglican Church, but the county of Lincoln was sufficiently enlightened to have 107 School Boards, and he trusted the day would come when the shop-keepers and farmers would throw off the ascendency of the sectarian churches of all sorts, and would combine to have their School Boards. But out of these 107 schools in Lincolnshire, only 13 received any help at all from this Bill; and in the Division he represented, out of the twenty School Boards, only one—a little Board School right up on the top of the wolds of Lincolnshire—received any help at all, that help being limited to £5. Was it reasonable to suppose that the farmers who were already rated so heavily in that distressed agricultural county would feel any enthusiasm for this Bill, or would consider that this money was being properly and equitably distributed? ["Hear, hear!" *from the Opposition Benches.*] He might refer to other counties. In Surrey, with 32 School Boards, only four got help; in Lancashire, with 53 School Boards, only four were assisted, and in this case the assistance was limited to 10d. per scholar. Contrast that with the 5s. per scholar given under the Voluntary Schools Act, and then ask whether there was anything like equity of treatment. Her Majesty's Government seemed to have absolutely abandoned—in fact they had refused to accept—what had been always considered to be the guiding principle or one of the guiding principles of the Act of 1870, viz., equality of treatment between the two classes of schools—Voluntary and Board Schools. He wished to point out that this Bill, coupled with the Voluntary Schools Act already passed, re-opened absolutely the whole so-called settlement of 1870. ["Hear, hear!"] He was glad to be supported in that view by his hon. Friend the Member for the city of Rochester. He was quite prepared for the Dissenting churches and communities of this country to fight their own battle and establish, if necessary, their own schools, but certainly the course which the Government had taken left the Dissenters of this country absolutely free to adopt any course they might think proper, and bring any pressure they could command upon any future Government to secure for the School Board schools of this country more adequate and reasonable assistance.

COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon) was bound to support the observations of his hon. Friend the Member for the Richmond Division of the North Riding as to this being a very disappointing Bill. He had had several representations from Warwickshire, where there were comparatively few School Boards, to the effect that practically nothing was received under the Bill by poor and rural parishes. He thought the scheme was really too ingenious. He did not, as a rule, approve of ingenious ingenuity in that way, because it was generally impracticable. He thoroughly believed the Education Department wished to deal fairly, as far as money would allow, with all the School Boards they had to do with, but it did so happen under the Bill that some School Boards got excessively large sums and some poor, struggling School Boards got no money at all. The School Boards in his constituency were agricultural parishes with a large area, very much distressed, and where the School Board had been forced upon the parish by stress of circumstances. In one of them it was true that the sum of £7 was received, but the others got nothing at all. On the borders of his constituency there was a large parish, partly artisan and partly agricultural, which did require large help and which received it. He was bound to say there was a feeling of disappointment in the rural parishes at the principle upon which the money was distributed, and the fact that many poor parishes would receive so little.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devon, South Molton) regretted that hon. Members opposite did not support hon. Members on his side when they brought forward the Motion declaring that no Bill would be satisfactory to the House unless it gave the same treatment to Board as to Voluntary Schools. He rose, on behalf of the rural districts, to protest against the niggardliness of the Government in their treatment of the small rural schools. The Government had shown a strange lack of what was necessary for the educational efficiency of the rural School Board Schools. The Education Department, as the last speaker had said, no doubt wished to deal fairly with the rural Board Schools, but he believed they were hampered by the ecclesiastical tendencies of those who probably sat behind the Vice President. In his constituency in North Devon there were 31 Board Schools, containing 2,748 scholars in average attendance. The School Boards paid no less a sum than £1,600 a year in rates, or 12s. 6d. per scholar, being nearly double the average voluntary subscriptions of 6s. 10½d., and if they had been Voluntary Schools they would have received no less than £687 a year. Unfortunately they were Board Schools, and they received the miserable dole of £66 a year, or less than one-tenth the amount they would have got had they been Voluntary Schools. That was only 6d. per child as contrasted with the 5s. given to the children in Voluntary Schools. How was this gigantic grant distributed among the schools in his constituency? There were two which received between them £64 a year out of the £66, and there were two which received £1 a year each. To call that relief was ridiculous. To give a School Board £1 a year was to give it what would not be enough to buy a blackboard, and what would hardly keep the children in slate pencils. To fritter away public money in such small grants could do no good, and as a Unionist newspaper in the West of England said the other day, it was a wasteful use of public money the like of which had never before been sanctioned by Parliament. They could not say that giving a School Board in a parish £1 a year was legislation. It was a parody of all justice. It was a kind of Parliamentary pantomime with the Vice President as chief performer. In North Devon they got an average of £1. 5s. per School Board, which it was grotesque to describe as any relief. In his constituency there was a School Board parish in which the ratepayers actually paid 25s. for every scholar in average attendance, yet they got nothing in relief from this dole. It seemed to him the principle of the Bill was that the ratepayers who paid most locally received least Imperially, and those who paid the least locally received the most from the Imperial grant. In his constituency the people paid nearly double the amount of the average voluntary subscriptions in rates and yet they got only one-tenth of the amount the schools would have received if they had been Voluntary Schools. He contended that that was most injurious to all education in the country districts. If the late Government had introduced a Bill to give £600,000 to the School Boards and only £100,000 to the Voluntary Schools hon. Gentlemen opposite would have had a fit of ecclesiastical hysterics, and would have indulged in all sorts of declamations against the wickedness of the Government. He thought it would have been much wiser for the supporters of Voluntary Schools in that House to have treated all classes of schools alike, rather than to have endeavoured to cripple the School Boards. He maintained that the country districts required as much money for education as did the towns. The right hon. Gentleman, the Vice President, when he introduced the Bill of last year said that, as a general rule, while the Board Schools in the great cities had proved themselves extremely efficient in education, the Board Schools in the country had proved themselves inefficient. If that were so why give enormous sums to the towns and such small sums to the country districts? If they had wanted to improve education they should have given the money to the localities where education, according to the right hon. Gentleman, was inefficient, but the system adopted by the Government for the distribution of the grant was a gross parody upon any kind of justice in legislation.

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe) regretted that expressions like those they had heard from the two hon. Members on the Government Benches, representing the feeling in two counties of England—Warwickshire and the North Riding of Yorkshire—were not given expression to upon the earlier stages of this Bill. He thought much might have been done if hon. Gentlemen opposite representing School Board districts had, on the Voluntary Schools Bill, expressed the feelings to which they were now giving utterance, as to the injustice of this unequal treatment of Board and Voluntary Schools. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a somewhat belated protest to make now, because nothing remained but to utter the protest. While they had had strong representations over and over again from his side of the House as to the wrong principle which had guided the treatment of different classes of schools by the Government, they had not had those protests at a sufficiently early time from those hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House who represented School Board constituencies in various parts of the country. He could assure the House from his knowledge of Lancashire that the feelings which the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of the North Riding had given expression to were shared by many of the School Board districts in that county. ["Hear, hear!"] School Boards in many small places were trying to do their duty for the education of the children, and there was an intense feeling of injustice among all parties as to the way in which 5s. per child had been distributed among Voluntary Schools, while something less than 1s. was given to Board Schools. There was no doubt that the effect of this legislation would be to unsettle the Education question, and all the vexed questions so happily settled by the Act of 1870 would be opened up. They had heard speeches from the noble Lord the Member for Rochester and his Friend Mr. Athelstan Riley, rejoicing over the settlement. He wondered whether in a few years' time the noble Lord and Mr. Athelstan Riley, who arrogated to themselves to speak in the name of the Church Party, would rejoice in the same way. Did the noble Lord suppose that this question could be left where this Bill left it? [Viscount Cranborne: "No, certainly not!"] Then he ventured to think the noble Lord would speak in a very different tone in a few years' time. He did not wish to detain the House with any prolonged observations on the Third Reading of this Bill, but he would repeat that a feeling of injustice and unequal treatment had been aroused amongst the ratepayers who had to provide the money for the School Boards. Subsequent experience of the inequality and injustice must strengthen that feeling, and he was convinced that in the future it would be necessary to review the whole question, and to take care that it was dealt with in a very different way to that in which his Government had dealt with it. ["Hear, hear!"]

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Sir John Gorst, Cambridge University) said he would not reply to the general protest of the right hon. Gentleman, as it had been replied to over and over again. He rose for the purpose of making a few observations in answer to the very real grievance to which his hon. Friends the Members for Warwickshire and the Richmond Division of Yorkshire had called attention, and that was the position of the small rural School Boards with a very large area and very sparse population, in which the rateable value was low and the cost of education under the system of the Act of 1870 ran up to enormous sums. One case had been quoted in which it had reached no less a sum than £6. There was no doubt that the position of these small School Boards was a very difficult one, and that the Act of 1870, which succeeded so well in great cities, which had given London, Manchester, and Liverpool their admirable Board Schools and their high standard of education, had not worked equally successfully in the rural districts, where the cost was out of all proportion to the education given. Her Majesty's Government would be only too glad if they could induce Parliament to consent to a Measure by which they could really be placed in a more satisfactory condition; but the figures of this Bill could not have been altered so as to give a larger grant to the rural districts without making the Bill so wide as to include very large cities like London itself and imposing on the public funds sums to which no Chancellor of the Exchequer would agree. ["Hear, hear!"] Another reason was that money was not the only thing, not even the chief thing, the rural School Boards required. They required organisation a great deal more than money—["hear, hear!"]—and he ventured to say that there would never be a satisfactory condition of public education in rural districts until there were much larger areas and authorities exercising jurisdiction over much wider areas. ["Hear, hear!"] He would like to remind the House that this matter was dealt with by the Bill of last year. Clauses in that Bill were directed to giving, at all events to the ratepayers and inhabitants of those districts the opportunity of merging themselves in larger areas and of having an authority capable of taking charge of elementary education in the counties, and which would have relieved if not put an end to the grievance of which hon. Members so justly complained. ['Hear, hear!"] Of course it was not for him to complain of the action Parliament thought fit to take last year, but he wished to warn the House that they could not relieve the real grievance of these small School Boards with their scattered populations by a mere grant of public money. Even if they had the power under this Bill to give them a large grant, in an expenditure amounting to £6 a child, what would even 5s. per child do? The cost would still be £5. 15s. How much better off would they be after receiving that relief than they are now? ["Hear, hear!"] The matter could not be remedied by the drastic methods hon. Members recommended. Those who entertained a sort of fetish respect for the Act of 1870 must make up their minds that that system must be amended in certain particulars, that the small rural School Board must be put an end to, and that the authority for education must be an authority exercising jurisdiction over a wider area and able to organise and co-ordinate education in a proper manner. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. A. H. DYKE ACLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham) said the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the matter of federation of small School Boards, and appeared to think that was an argument against the protests made in this Bill; but this Bill did not deal with organisation. It was purely a financial Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman would have found that if there had been a proposal for the federation of School Boards in small areas, without anything dangerous to School Boards, there would have been no opposition from that side of the House. Therefore, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would relieve them of any responsibility for having prevented it. It was not that part of the Bill of last year that killed it. [*Cheers.*] Let them have no red herring drawn across the trail with reference to last year's Bill or the needs of small School Boards under this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Their needs had been exemplified from both sides of the House, and hon. Gentlemen had shown how, from a financial point of view, they were made to suffer. Theirs was a perfectly fair complaint, and no amount of federation would get rid of it. The right hon. Gentleman said he would not say a word about the general protest against the Bill, because it had been replied to over and over again. He wished to know what the reply was? ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman said he would not deal with that, but would deal with the real grievance. He wished the right hon. Gentleman could deal with it. They all knew that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was master of the situation; but although the Chancellor of the Exchequer would never have agreed to a sum of £500,000 for School Boards, he had agreed to a sum of £600,000 for Voluntary Schools. [*Cheers.*] If £750,000 were the only sum available, and if it had been equally distributed between Voluntary and Board Schools, the grievance would have been largely modified. ["Hear, hear!"] The Vice President said that School Boards which had a burden of rates equivalent to £6 per child would not get much relief out of 5s. But there were School Boards, both in town and country, whose expenditure was less than £1 per child, and in these cases 5s. would be a real relief. ["Hear, hear!"] They had no power to increase the amount given under the Bill, but they were right in protesting against the insufficiency of the grant. They were right, moreover, in protesting against the irregularity and inequality which the methods of the Bill were developing and would still more largely develop as time went on. Some Boards would get relief to the extent of £1,000 in one year, and the amount would go down to £500 in the next year, and up to £900 in the year following. That unequal method would tend to wastefulness, and would irritate the ratepayers by reason of the varying demands that would be made upon them from year to year. Whether on the ground of irregularity and inequality of action, or on the broader ground of the extreme insufficiency of the grant, they must protest, as they had protested at every stage, against the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said he should have thought this stage of the Bill would have been taken without any discussion whatever. [*Opposition laughter.*] There were but few principles involved, and these had been sufficiently discussed on the previous stages. But now that the Debate had arisen, he should be sorry to see it closed without some correction of the false impression to which the statements of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rotherham and his Friends had given rise. He could not admit that the methods of the Bill were open to the charge levelled against them by the right hon. Gentleman. Section 97 of the Act of 1870 was always open to far more serious accusations, for under it the grants did not depend on the way in which a locality had discharged its duty, but were the same whether the rate was 3d. in the pound or 2s. 6d. in the pound. That anomaly was removed by the Bill, and the relief would now be in proportion to the way in which a district discharged its duty, as well as in proportion to the necessities of the district. The Bill, in his opinion had been very skilfully drafted, and the application of its principles had been wisely bestowed over the country. He joined in the regret that the total amount was not larger, but the method of application was not, in his view, open to objection. This legislation was incomplete in itself, and must be followed at a very early date by further Measures dealing with the question of national education. The necessity for further reform did not arise from the introduction of the Bills of this Session, but from the facts of the case. The country would sooner or later have demanded a large Measure such as that introduced last Session. The disturbance of the compromise of 1870 was not caused by the present legislation, but already existed. He asked the House not to attach too much importance to the protest that had been raised, particularly from the Ministerial side, with regard to the Bill. He did not think that, with regard to some of the smaller School Boards, the protest was altogether fair or just. Reform was not to be found for these small School Boards in the amount of the grant awarded to them, but must be found in a Measure totally abolishing the small School Board, and placing educational affairs in rural districts in the hands of authorities having control over larger and wider areas than those which at present existed, and with power to levy a rate over rich and poor districts alike, so as in some way to equalise the charge throughout the country. It would be most ungracious on his part, as representing one of the districts largely benefited by the Bill, if he did not offer his cordial thanks to the Government for introducing it. He believed that many districts, both urban and rural, would look upon the Bill with a large amount of satisfaction, and that the individual ratepayer in these districts would not forget that it was from the present Unionist Government that he received this measure of relief.

Mr. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield) said that the Bill afforded a fitting opportunity for reviewing the educational policy, or no-policy, of the Government. They had had a great opportunity, arising from the fact that there was a general conviction that the Act of 1870 needed amendment; they had an able Minister of Education, and they had a large majority behind them, and there was no disposition to thwart them on the part of the Opposition. How had they used the opportunity? The Vice President of the Council had just admitted that the mere granting of additional public money would not improve the condition of the rural schools, and had described the changes which would be really effective; but the Government had not proposed any such changes. They had not raised the school age, though almost everybody admitted the necessity for doing so. They had provided no guarantees for either increased school efficiency or for the maintenance of voluntary subscriptions. A large additional grant of public money had been voted to Voluntary Schools, but without any provision for local representative control. The teachers were not to be protected, as they should be, from the exactions of their clerical taskmasters. Lastly, the admitted grievances of Nonconformists were not redressed. There would still be thousands of parishes with only a Church of England School, from which Nonconformist teachers and pupil teachers would be excluded. All these demands had been made, but not one had been conceded. Those were the Government's sins of omission. Their sins of commission were less numerous, but were still serious, for they had granted £616,000 a year to Voluntary Schools and only a paltry £110,000 to some Board Schools, and to many of them nothing. Why was such a distinction made? Two grounds had been stated. One was, that to treat both classes alike would prevent the Voluntary Schools successfully competing with Board Schools; but the Government had decisively rejected that plea in opposing the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Rochester in the Committee on that Bill. Nor could the other objection—the plea of poverty on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—be maintained, seeing that he had had unprecedented resources at his disposal. The half million which would probably be wasted on the Navy would have been exactly sufficient to place the two classes of schools on the same footing. But the greatest mistake of the Government was the creation of non-representative bodies, which would weaken the authority of the Education Department, and many of which would, it was certain, work for ecclesiastical instead of educational ends. The educational measures of the Government were but makeshifts and temporary measures. They would do nothing to improve education, while they would create new anomalies and inflict great injustice. Mr. Forster was honoured for the Act of 1870, but the Bills of the present Government would bring to them no honour, because there was too much reason to believe that they had sacrificed educational interests to the interests of sectarianism.

Mr. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) regretted very much that, in spite of the discouragement of last Session, the Government had not attempted to put the Education question on a surer basis. The two Education Bills which had been introduced this year did produce in many places a great number of fresh anomalies—London, for instance, was very badly treated—["hear, hear!"]—and he trusted that even during the present Parliament they might find time for legislation which would set at rest this great question. He was persuaded that the only way to solve the difficulty was for the State to take on itself the whole cost of secular teaching.

Bill read a Third time, amid cheers, and passed.

FINANCE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

*Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) proposed to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add instead thereof the words

> "in the opinion of this House, the existing fiscal system of the country is unequal to the continually increasing demands of the public service, and that the time has arrived for recourse being had to more varied sources of taxation."

He said that Her Majesty's Government themselves had called attention to the pressing need of an investigation of this subject, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his Budget speech last year, drew special attention to the difficulties which anyone occupying his position might find himself in in the event of having to find some means of adding to the revenue. It was true that the other day the right hon. Gentleman spoke in terms which betokened great confidence on his part as to the condition of our revenue at the present time, but the fact remained that no longer ago than last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer drew attention to the extremely narrow basis upon which our system of revenue was founded, and in doing so he was only following in the footsteps of his predecessor the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:—

> "There has been a gradual transfer of burden from the indirect to the direct taxpayer of this country. . . . . That, I think the Committee will see, has been a progressive and remarkable change. I do not say the policy is wrong. There is no doubt that under it the industry and enterprise of this country, our commerce and trade, and our wealth, have been enormously developed, and, therefore, I suppose we may say it is justified by its results. But I must point out that our system as it now stands does not add to the popular support which any Chancellor of the Exchequer can enlist in aid of economy."

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say:—

> "The indirect taxpayer of this country is very moderately burdened—indeed, very lightly burdened, if he neither drinks nor smokes. We have arrived now at this position—that in time of peace we have an Income Tax of 8d. in the pound, we have Death Duties at a point which, I suppose, hardly anybody will wish to increase, and we have indirect taxation levied only on a few articles of great consumption."

We had a system of revenue which was only capable of expansion in time of need in practically one or two directions, and he did not think his right hon. Friend, or anyone who was likely to occupy his place, would assert that our present revenue from Customs and Excise was one on the stability of which we could reckon. When the time came that the country was in a less prosperous condition, down went these sources of revenue. What had they to replace them? Nothing, as far as he could see, but the income tax. He passed over the possibility of anyone increasing the death duty. He did not think that even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth would suggest the possibility of augmenting the revenue in the direction of the Death Duty. That was a tax which was most unpopular in the country. It was a tax which was not only oppressive to those who had to pay it, but was the occasion of very grave inconvenience to those who, though they did not personally pay it, were indirectly interested in it on account of their employment terminating through its harsh operations. When he carried the House on to the diminution of the purchasing power of those persons, they would easily see that, from one cause or another, there was no class of society which did not, to some extent, feel the effect of the burden which these death duties had imposed. Nor from a merely revenue standpoint must sight be lost of the fact that this was a tax upon capital and not income, and that while loose cash (or "free personalty," as the Chancellor of the Exchequer styled it) had already found means of largely escaping its operation, real estate would be subjected to a steady diminution of its liability to duty through the deductions in respect of charges arising out of provisions for previous payments of that impost. Hence a shrinkage of revenues as time advances. How did they stand with regard to what he might call their general system of finance? The other day the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to the fact that the country had doubled its income during the last 60 years, but he omitted to tell them that in the future he saw no reasonable prospect of keeping their national expenditure within even its present enlarged bounds. His right hon. Friend knew perfectly well that, year after year, the demand for an increase of expenditure went on. The House of Commons, so far from curtailing expenditure, was the direct cause of a vast deal of extravagance. ["Hear, hear!"] He thought there would be general concurrence that no limit could possibly be placed upon their Army and Navy, so far as the present was concerned, but there were many items in their Civil Service which that House would do well to more closely supervise. ["Hear, hear!"] Instead of this, the Government was egged on by Members from all quarters of the House to continually increase the national expenditure. There was one point in connection with their expenditure which he ventured to think was a matter of some danger. He had already referred to the fact that the bulk of the voters paid little or nothing in the shape of taxation. That being so, there seemed to him less chance than there otherwise would be of any effective curtailment and control of their national expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech of 1895 said:—

> "I wish to put before the Committee the present condition of our financial system. I wish to ask them to consider, at their leisure, what the position may be of a Chancellor of the Exchequer who in some future year may have to meet and continue an enormous increase of expenditure under this system of taxation, and to ask them whether they are quite sure that in such circumstances our present financial policy can be retained."

He thought his right hon. Friend did good service in addressing those words of warning to the House. It had been the fashion in many quarters to speak of their financial system as a matter which they ought to be proud of, and any idea of departing from it to any large extent was absolutely scouted in some quarters. He would remind the House that, at the present moment, their much vaunted system had produced, both in Scotland and in Ireland, the loudest protests on the ground that it was contrary to justice, and that those two countries were not fairly treated under its provisions. That being so, he hoped he should not be charged with having raised a discordant note amidst the general satisfaction with which their existing financial system was viewed. On the contrary, he thought the bulk of the House would be of opinion that the time had arrived when, in the words of his Amendment, recourse must be had to some more varied sources of taxation. They relied, in a time of peace, upon the income tax, and upon the income tax alone, to make up any deficit that might arise in their national income. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer and any Member of that House who took any interest in the soundness of their financial system must feel some misgiving upon that point. There could be no doubt that having recourse to the income tax as their main financial prop in a time of peace was contrary to all the axioms which had been laid down in the past. He had endeavoured to deal separately with this question so far as the revenue was concerned, as distinguished from the development of our home trade. The two subjects were different, and, in his judgment, should be kept distinct from each other. Now, as to the directions in which they might fairly look for some increase in the taxable area. Of course he should be told that there was no need for any change. He hoped he had disposed, at any rate, of that reply. The right hon. Member for West Monmouth only the other day congratulated the House and the country that "times had mended and improved," he was not quoting his actual words, but simply the purport of his observations. He said that prosperity had recurred even to agriculture, and that corn had risen in price; and he went on to say that there was an end to what he called the "miserable German scare." But the right hon. Gentleman did not speak for everyone, even of his own Party on that subject; for the late Prime Minister had drawn the attention of the country, in words which he thought were very justly weighed, to the exposure of the dangers to British trade contained in that very able work by Mr. Williams, "Made in Germany." The right hon. Gentleman appeared to be amused by his reference to that work; but he thought that whether they shared Mr. Williams's views or not, hon. Gentlemen would agree that it was a most able work, and it was one which any person who read it might derive very great instruction from. No doubt exception was taken to certain groups of statistics, and letters were written and official memoranda were published endeavouring to refute Mr. Williams's statements. In his reply, however, he demolished all his critics, including the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth. He could only recommend the right hon. Gentleman to re-read "Made in Germany," and also to cast his eye over the very able exposure of the attempted replies which followed Mr. Williams's statement. Now, how did this question of "Made in Germany" stand? Lord Rosebery called attention to it, and he suggested that the

Government should appoint a small Committee to go into the subject, and see how the facts really were. The Government did appoint a Committee. He was not sure that he could have honestly said that he thought that Committee an impartially chosen body. He thought he could have almost written the Report of one, at any rate, of its members, before the Committee began its labours. But, as far as the memorandum went, which he might say was the official reply to "Made in Germany," it practically and substantially confirmed the bulk of Mr. Williams's examination of the case; and, although it endeavoured to put a more hopeful gloss on some of the figures he quoted, it was bound to admit in the end that unless British trade was better attended to by those who were engaged in it, and unless certain steps were taken, there was a poor prospect for this country as regarded its competition with many other countries. Now, as to our produce and manufactures. There could be no doubt, of course, that the figures of to-day compared with 60 years ago showed an increase in our export trade. At the same time they showed an alarming increase in imports. They showed that we were more and more dependent upon imports of foreign goods; and that in too many cases in which we used not only to supply ourselves but were the largest exporters to all parts of the world. The imports were not only breadstuffs and raw materials, but it appeared from official statistics that £100,000,000 worth of manufactured and partly manufactured goods were annually brought into this country—goods which in every instance could be produced quite as well from our own resources at home. Now that, he thought, would be admitted to be a very serious consideration. They were told that they had, at any rate in some particular directions, maintained the superiority of England as a manufacturing and exporting country. But when they came to analyse the figures, they found that while the production of British textiles had immensely shrunk, there had been a large increase in the export of coal, which was, of course, a raw material, of pig iron, which was practically a raw material, and in machinery. Well, machinery was a form of export which the House would possibly realise carried with it very large and perhaps dangerous issues —because we were supplying other countries with the means of eventually doing without us, and of not only supplying themselves, but in many cases successfully competing with us in the markets of the world. ["Hear, hear!"] He would now, with the permission of the House, point out in what directions he ventured to suggest that recourse should be had to more varied sources of taxation. He knew it had been the habit in that House to attack the tea duties, and to say that the tea duties—and the duties on coffee, chicory, dried fruits, cocoa, and other articles would come within that category—from which we derived about 4½ millions sterling per annum, ought to be abolished or reduced. It was constantly pointed out that they were duties on articles which we do not produce in this country, and that the burden might be fairly transferred from those articles to articles which were capable of being produced at home. Now, he entirely shared those views, and the reason why he had not committed himself to supporting a Motion for the reduction of the tea duties was that because unless and until some adequate substitute was provided by means of which the consumers of tea and kindred articles should contribute to the revenue, he held that it was unsound finance to abolish them without supplying in their place some indirect taxes to which the bulk of the population would contribute. Otherwise they would be adding still more to the position that those who called the tune did not help to pay the piper. There was a Motion the other day which he could not associate himself with for abolishing the tea duties and supplying their place by taxes upon imports of foreign manufactured articles. Now, although he approved of abolishing the tea duties under proper conditions, and although he was distinctly in favour of a duty on foreign manufactures, he did not consider the one an equivalent of the other from a sound point of view of finance; and he thought it well to mention this because it might appear somewhat inconsistent not to have supported a proposal both sides of which commended themselves to one's judgment. He ventured to suggest that there was a means of providing revenue without unduly burdening the people which would enable our home products to be fairly encouraged without materially adding to the burden on the people. He had already mentioned that a hundred million's worth of foreign manufactured goods annually came into this country. A very small impost upon them would produce a very handsome addition to the national Budget. ["Hear, hear!"] And he did not think anybody would be able to make any Party cry, or to make any political claptrap out of a tax of that kind. He had no wish to shirk the issue when he was asked what tax he would propose to substitute for the tea duties. They were told the people of this country would never submit to a tax on the necessaries of life. Well, the articles included under the tea duties were certainly necessaries of life, and to transfer the impost from one branch of the necessaries of life to another would be in no shape or form an injustice to the consumers. A very moderate tax on imported corn, known as the shilling registration duty, which was most unwisely abandoned by Mr. Lowe within his Parliamentary recollection, would now produce (according to the present Chancellor of the Exchequer) something like 2½ millions. A 2s. registration duty would produce close on five millions, and, therefore, more than replace the tea duties. Would it produce any inconvenience to the consumer to transfer this charge from the grocer to the baker? If anyone was foolhardy enough to pretend a social revolution would result from the transfer, he would remind him that nearly one-half—certainly two-fifths—of the corn duty would be paid, not by the consumers of bread, but by the consumers of barley, oats, maize, etc. What would be the cost to the people of this country of this impost on corn? He had heard no less a person than the late Chancellor of the Exchequer talk about the oppressive effect of a tax upon corn. It was a stock argument that in 1812 corn went up—he thought it was only for a week or two—to about 180s. a quarter, and when the average selling price for the year was 126s. a quarter He had heard that mentioned as a specimen of the outrageous injustice of the landowning class, that the landowners in Parliament ground down the people and made them pay these huge prices for the necessaries of life on purpose to bolster up rents. Hon. Gentlemen who had looked into this point were fully aware that the high price of corn which at that time temporarily obtained was not due to any duty. In 1812 the duty was a merely nominal registration duty of about 8½d. When prices were high in the early part of the century they were not due to the imposition of duties, which were practically taken off altogether at that time, but were due to the condition of war which then prevailed, cutting off supplies from abroad, and to bad harvests. Those who said that the people of this country would be cruelly oppressed by any recurrence to the corn duties could not be aware how ridiculously small the effect would be. He himself was not in favour of any fixed duty, but of a sliding scale. However, for the purpose of argument, he would assume that under the operation of a sliding scale it happened that a duty of 5s. per quarter was imposed, which would not, according to precedent, raise the selling price by more than half the amount of such duty. Even taking it that the selling price was increased 5s., it would only mean to the bread consumer the large sum of one half-farthing per day, seven-eighths of a penny per week, or 3s. 9½d. per individual per year. He had indicated that under these conditions the tea duty might very fairly and on sound financial principles be remitted. The tea duty worked out at 2s. 3½d. per head of the population. Even if the sliding scale should involve at any given time a 5s. duty on corn, that left a balance as against the consumer of only 1s. 6d. for the whole year, and that he urged was a matter that need not alarm anyone. A 5s. duty would produce no less a sum than £12,250,000 in the year, therefore, he thought he had shown the Chancellor of the Exchequer how he could get a balance of between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000 by abandoning the tea duty and substituting a duty of 5s. upon corn. Would any one, after that, tell the House that there would be bread riots, disturbances, and all the rest, if so moderate an impost was adopted? By means of reciprocal relations with other parts of the Empire they might obtain their food supplies under conditions which would at the same time develop the resources of the Empire and secure them against being wholly dependent upon foreign food supplies. He did not wish to identify himself with the free admission of colonial produce—no colony had ever asked for it or was prepared to grant it in return—but what he did advocate was a preferential tariff under which the food stuffs and other commodities of their colonies would come into this country upon more favourable terms than those of countries outside the limits of the British Empire. He had shown that many millions were within the reach of the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he thought fit to rise superior to the prejudices which had so restricted the taxable area he had in his hands. He did not think any one would assert that it was possible to do without fresh sources of taxation for any great length of time. He could promise any Chancellor of the Exchequer who embarked upon some sounder system of finance a hearty support from the great bulk of the producers of this country, if, in the course of the financial measures, they were protected from some of the dangers to which they were now exposed from undue and excessive foreign competition. Would any hon. Gentleman deny that the pre-eminence of this country was rapidly ebbing in some of the staple industries? The cotton trade, for example, was not partaking of that general prosperity which the Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared to think prevailed all over the country, but was dwindling, and in many instances was actually being extinguished.

MR. GEORGE HARWOOD (Bolton): As connected with the cotton trade, I feel bound to say that that statement is not correct. [" Hear, hear! "] I am not speaking of my own personal experience, but from a knowledge of the trade as a whole. The Lancashire cotton trade has not dwindled, but has distinctly improved. [" Hear, hear! "]

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER replied that whatever might be the case in the hon. Gentleman's immediate neighbourhood, he feared he would not find confirmation from many other parts of Lancashire.

MR. HARWOOD: I am not speaking of my own immediate neighbourhood, but of the condition of the trade of Lancashire as a whole, of which I have fair knowledge. [" Hear, hear! "]

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER could only say that many persons largely engaged in the Lancashire cotton industry formed a very different estimate of its prospects from that of the hon. Gentleman. He had heard of instances in which private concerns had been shut down, in which machinery which was giving employment to large numbers of workmen in Lancashire had been transported to Bombay or Japan, and was now being used in the production of cheap articles in the Far East. He did not believe it could be denied that the condition of the cotton trade in this country was one to occasion great alarm. Many of the limited liability companies were getting scarcely any dividend, and even those were anxiously considering whether they should not move to places where they could carry on their businesses under more favourable conditions. He challenged the hon. Gentleman opposite to find any authority to show that capital could be so advantageously spent in Lancashire as it could be in Japan or Bombay. The truth was that not only had our great industry of agriculture shrunk, but the textile trades were also languishing, and so far from our keeping pace industrially with other countries, we were already lagging behind. He hoped that the House, while not interfering on this occasion with the financial proposals of the Government, would at any rate afford his right hon. Friend some encouragement with a view to the discovery of some varied sources of income. The Resolution would, he hoped, afford an opportunity for some suggestions being made which might be of use to his right hon. Friend. He, of course, did not ask him to take back his Budget and recast his financial system at five minutes' notice; but he thought he was justified in asking him to look at the relative progress made by other countries under different fiscal systems, to rid his mind of the idea that our prosperity during the last 60 years was due to the present system, and to consider how far he could obtain some fresh sources of taxation which would enable our financial system to rest on a more sound basis. He begged to move his Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. VESEY KNOX (Londonderry) said he rose to support not so much the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, as the actual terms of his Motion. The House had had many opportunities of discussing the incidence of direct taxation and its burden on the country, and he was one of those who believed that, on the whole, the Budget of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire had effected desirable changes in the incidence of direct taxation, for it had gone in the direction of putting the heaviest on the broadest shoulders, and making the rich pay proportionately more than the poor. The reason why he supported the Motion was that he ventured in deference to bring before the House a suggestion that the time was rife in some measure to deal with indirect taxation in the same way, and to endeavour to secure that a similar proportion of indirect taxation should fall on the poorer classes. It was now the principle of all Chancellors of the Exchequer to levy as large a sum in the way of indirect taxation as possible, upon as few consumable commodities as possible; to levy it on those commodities, not in proportion to their value, but in proportion to the quantity consumed. Therefore, necessarily, the commodities selected for taxation had been those which were consumed most largely by the masses of the poorer people. Indirect taxation need not necessarily fall upon the poor than the rich. For instance, a tax was levied on silk in America and a large revenue was obtained from it.

MR. BARTLEY: How much does it bring in?

MR. KNOX: Over £2,000,000; and it brought in less than it might if there were an excise as well as an import duty. If an excise as well as a customs duty were applied in this country in the case of silk, he ventured to think that five or six millions might be raised, without materially affecting the amount consumed. There had been very little change in indirect taxation for 30 or 40 years. Thirty or forty years ago, when the commodities taxed were very much dearer than now, a fixed duty in gold was placed on commodities which the people were most accustomed to consume. As years went by those commodities had become much cheaper. That was true of all articles of taxation. It was true of beer, of tobacco, and of spirits. Therefore, the effect of the system had been that in proportion to the value of the commodity the tax had been growing heavier year by year. Ten shillings was worth more now in commodities than it was 20 or 30 years ago, and although the duties were fixed nominally, owing to the increase in the value of gold, the duties had really been steadily rising, and had become larger in proportion to the value of the commodity. For instance, the value of spirits before the duty was paid was now only 1s. 6d. a gallon, this low price being due chiefly to changes, he would not say improvements, in the method of manufacture. Thirty or forty years ago the price was something like 3s. 6d. a gallon; therefore the duty was very much heavier now in proportion to the value of the commodity. He knew that by many Free Traders it was said to be a necessary part of Free Traders that duties should be levied as specific duties and not as *ad valorem* duties, but he found that that notion was confined to England. The Free Trade Party, the Democratic Party, in America, was in favour of the *ad valorem* duty. So was the Tariff Reform Party in Canada. Why, in the face of these facts, was it considered in this country that there should be any necessary connection between specific duties and Free Trade? It might be urged that there was greater difficulty in the collection of *ad valorem* duties; but it would probably be found that every change made in taxes with a view to making their burden more equable would involve some increased difficulty of collection. The Liberal Party had shown themselves, in the matter of direct taxation, in favour of taxing the rich more heavily than the poor; why should they not, whenever they had the opportunity, seek to apply the same principle in regard to indirect taxation? He had never been able to understand why the same rate of duty should be charged on the common tobacco consumed by the working man and on the more expensive kinds smoked by the middle and upper classes. Indeed, when they took this and other similar cases they would find *prima facie* ground for thinking that in enforcing specific and not *ad valorem* duties, Cobden and those who acted with him were actuated by the feeling of the middle classes, whose desire was to escape as far as possible from the burden of taxation. At the present time the taxes paid by the middle classes were very small indeed when compared with those paid by the poor. A very interesting speech was made on a recent occasion by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division

The hon. Member had good reason for being opposed to any change in our fiscal system. He was a most ardent prohibitionist. He had no need for alcoholic liquors and wished nobody else to consume them. To him the present system was an ideal system, because it placed so large a part of the taxation upon the shoulders of those who consumed alcoholic drink. But a very large number of the teetotallers of this country consumed a good deal of alcohol without, however, contributing to the revenue. Mr. Bannister, the Government analyst, in his evidence recently before the Licensing Commission, said that he had analysed herb beer and several so-called temperance drinks, and he found that the lowest proportion of alcohol contained in any of them was 2·9 per cent., while in one case it was as high as 13·7 per cent.—very much higher than the average percentage of alcohol in ordinary beer. [*Laughter.*] The hon. Member for Spen Valley had advised Irishmen if they wanted to reduce their taxation to add more water to their whisky. He calculated that if they attempted to make, with the use of whisky, a liquid not more heavily taxed than beer they should have to add 63 parts of water to one of whisky. He did not know whether that would be a liquid likely to meet with a large measure of consumption. [*Laughter.*] But what he wanted to point out was that it would contain less alcohol than liquor which was consumed by teetotallers, and on which no duty was paid. There were three classes of liquor drinkers in these countries—Irishmen and Scotchmen who consumed whisky, the average Englishman who took his alcohol in beer, and that minority of Englishmen who took their alcohol in temperance drinks. [*Laughter.*] The Irishman was taxed for his alcohol about six times as heavily as the Englishman who drank beer, while the Englishman who was wily enough to take his alcohol in temperance drinks of course escaped taxation altogether. [*Laughter.*] He contended that we ought so to rearrange our indirect taxation that the burden would fall more heavily on the rich than on the poor; and that we should attempt to catch the teetotaller who at present escaped almost entirely from indirect taxation. [*Laughter.*] Incidentally such a modification would have the effect of lightening the burden which pressed upon Ireland, and that was his principal reason for suggesting it. Personally, he did not think it would be possible to entirely remove the financial injustice under which Ireland suffered without imposing different financial systems upon the two countries, but he held that while maintaining the financial union between Great Britain and Ireland, it would still be possible by some such re-arrangement of indirect taxation as he had suggested to lighten the burden which pressed so heavily upon Ireland now, and to reduce appreciably the grievance from which Ireland suffered.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN (Suffolk, Woodbridge) called attention to the question of the Death Duties. His complaint, he said, was not so much in regard to the amount of the charge which these duties involved upon property, as to their unequal incidence. He did not say that the total amount of property in the country taxable for Death Duty could not afford to pay the sum which those duties now produced if evenly distributed, but he did say that the present incidence of the duties, while leaving some classes of property almost untouched, fell with extraordinary hardship upon certain individuals. It had been said that it would only be fair to give those duties at least a three years' trial before the question of making an Amendment in them was raised. That period of trial had now elapsed; and the best way of approaching the subject of amending the tax was to consider whether the objects which the right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Exchequer stated he had in view in introducing that particular form of taxation had been attained. Those objects were four in number—to equalise the payments on realty in proportion to the payments on personalty; to avoid the complications and difficulties which existed under the old duties; to secure that the extremely rich, the millionaires, were "bled;" and to avoid any injury to agriculture by the imposition of the new estate duties. He asserted that not a single one of those objects had been attained, and that, on the other hand, great hardships had been inflicted by this new form of taxation. ["Hear, hear!"]

To take the minor points first, it was the common opinion amongst lawyers that greater complications and difficulties existed under the new system than had prevailed under the old; and as personal property—the form of property usually possessed by the extremely rich—was easily transferred, the millionaire was well able to avoid the new duties by transferring his property during life. ["Hear, hear!"] But a more important point was whether the equalisation of the payments in respect to realty and personalty had been attained. A nominal equality might have been attained, but certainly not a real equality. The different conditions under which realty and personalty existed had not been fairly taken into consideration. The responsibility of landlords was often talked about. The landlords did not deny that responsibility, and they were willing to act up to it. It was expensive. It included, among other things, the employment of a large number of persons about the estate, and the keeping of tenants on the land by means of improvements and reductions in rent. But no such responsibility fell upon the owner of personalty ["Hear, hear!"] Again, the peculiar indivisibility of landed property had not been taken into account. A man who had his property invested in stocks and shares had no difficulty in selling out a portion of his property in order to pay the duty, and what remained was not affected by the transaction. But a man who had his entire capital vested in a business, a trade, or a landed estate was in a totally different position. He had to break off and sell a portion of his business or property, or, on the other hand, to fully mortgage that business or property in order to pay the duty, thereby greatly reducing the value of what remained, and perhaps making it difficult or impossible to carry on the business. Then there was another point of inequality between realty and personalty. That was the power of avoidance which personalty had—the power of escaping the duty by transfer before death. The Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking in the House on May 10 said:—

> "The only other suggestion that has been made, so far as I know, is the one by the hon. Member for Northumberland, viz., that I should in some way or other stop what he characterises as an evasion of the Death Duties. I take it that he means that people are making gifts in their lives instead of leaving their property to their heirs. In my opinion, that is a very proper practice, and certainly as long as I am Chancellor of the Exchequer I will do nothing so tyrannical and so unjust as to interfere with the liberty of a healthy man to dispose of his property to whomsoever he will."

That which was a proper practice in the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was confined entirely to personalty, because while realty was almost invariably in settlement, personalty was almost invariably free. Evidence that avoidance was now practised in the case of personalty was to be found in the Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman stated that within the last 12 months the amount of realty upon which duty was charged had increased by ten millions sterling, while the amount of personalty on which duty was charged had decreased by ten millions sterling; and the right hon. Gentleman attributed that state of things to the avoidance of duty by personalty. ["Hear, hear!"] Further evidence of that fact was contained in a letter written to him by a friend.

> "The Act is naturally avoided as much as possible,"

said the writer.

> "Its intense injustice is the cause. I believe they will get less out of my small property than they would have done under the old law, for if I live another year, except the coat on my back, I shall have little else." [*Laughter.*] "I know one large merchant who said he should make his sons partners and buy an annuity, and damn the Bill."—[*laughter*]—"and I don't know one friend about here who has not done all he can to evade the Act. Sooner or later this must tell. Remember Gladstone on our Irish policy, 'I don't say an unjust law ought to be broken, but I do say it will be.'"

[*Laughter and cheers.*]

He would quote a very high authority on this subject, the First Lord of the Admiralty, who said, on the introduction of the Act of 1894:—

> "I was advised by the Inland Revenue that after you had reached a certain point in putting on Death Duties you would then easily reach the point where the increase of duty would not necessarily bring you in an increase of revenue. . . . A man now says, I think it better to retain the control of my money

in my own hands and will leave it to my sons when I die, but if you are going to take several thousands of pounds from the family money and waste it by paying it to the Exchequer '

—that was a very strong phrase coming from an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer —[*laughter*]—

"it would form a very potent motive for distributing the money during the lifetime of the testator."

He thought he had quoted sufficient authority to prove that the avoidance of the duties was and would be practised, and was a force with which they had to reckon. And in this respect these duties were only following the general law in regard to taxes of this character. Land tax originally imposed upon all property including personalty, salaries and stock in trade, was so effectually evaded by all but land that it was eventually repealed except in regard to realty, and now fell upon that class of property only. The same had occurred in regard to rates, and this was forcibly pointed out by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer when discussing the 1894 Budget, therefore—in the history of the land tax and of rates, they found precedents for this state of things. In regard to the distribution of the load on the two classes of property, the inequality was very great. They ought to consider in many cases, not only the weight or amount of the load, but the manner in which it was placed on the particular body which had to bear it and the particular condition of that body. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had acted much as would a man who insisted on putting the saddle of a horse on a camel, and distributing the burden which was to be borne in exactly the same way on both. Also this extra burden was imposed principally on realty, and so upon agriculture, at a time when agriculture was in its worst condition. The right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire denied that these duties galled the shoulders of those who paid them, and based his contention on the fact that the Estate Duty was usually paid in one sum rather than by instalments. On April 29 of this year the right hon. Gentleman said:—

"So far from the pressure being undue, and so far from the instalments being necessary, people find it more convenient to pay the Death Duties at once; is not that testimony to the fact that these funds have been provided without undue pressure on the taxpayer, and do not gall the shoulders of those who have to pay them?"

Captain Pretyman.

The right hon. Gentleman had, he believed, authorised the payments by instalments, with the idea of somewhat lightening the burden of those who had to pay them. [Sir W. HARCOURT *signified assent.*] Yes, but he forgot that the old duty was payable only out of income, and, therefore, payment by instalments did facilitate their payment. But this was a charge of a totally different character; it was a charge upon capital. If he could show that the actual incidence of the duty was in some cases in excess of the income available to pay it for each of the eight years in which the instalments were to be paid, he thought he should have proved the right hon. Gentleman's contention to be incorrect. In such cases the only resource of the person who had to pay the duty was either to mortgage his property or to sell a portion of it, and that was the reason why the duty was usually paid in a lump sum instead of by instalments. ["Hear, hear!"] He would take the ordinary case of a landed estate producing £10,000 a year. At 20¾ years' purchase which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer told them was the average assessment, it would pay on £207,500; the duty at 6½ per cent. would be £13,500, and if paid in instalments with the 3 per cent. interest it would amount to £15,000. The instalments, in round figures, would thus be about £2,000 a year for eight years. If the money was raised on mortgage a man could obtain £13,000 at a cost of about £500 a year in interest. The successor, therefore, had before him the alternative of paying £2,000 a year for eight years, or £500 a year permanent charge. But there was also another strong inducement to raise the money in this way. Supposing he died when this payment was incomplete, or shortly afterwards, that mortgage was deducted from the value of the property before the next duty was payable, and the duty of the next inheritor would be greatly reduced. In the other case, if he starved himself for eight years to pay the very large charge to the Exchequer, he became simply an unpaid agent for the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the sole purpose of placing his successor in a similar position. It was just as easy to pay off a mortgage as to pay the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and supposing a man found it convenient and easy to save his income he could do so.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I had no idea it was so easy. [*Laughter.*]

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN said perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would not think it so easy when he had finished. [*Laughter.*] Besides the estate duty as above, there was the succession duty to pay, which, except in the case of lineals, was a very large sum, and must be paid out of income. There were also certain charges, not mortgages, for younger children and dowagers, for which no rebate was given, and which must be paid out of income. Though in some cases these did not exist, they usually did, and were very heavy indeed. He would take, in illustration of his argument, the concrete case of a property which was in the course of paying the duties at the present time—the Rufford property, which was situated in Nottinghamshire. Within the last 15 years that property had paid no less than £88,000. He had a letter from the solicitor to the property saying that at the minimum figure the succession duty now payable would be £50,000 and the estate duty £100,000. The available net income of the property after agents' expenses had been paid was now £19,000 a year. [Sir W. HARCOURT *signified dissent.*] But he had it from the owner of the property in his own handwriting, and he assumed that he knew his own affairs better than the right hon. Gentleman knew them. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR W. HARCOURT: No such charge would be possible.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: The right hon. Gentleman had no notion what was possible under the Finance Act. [*Cheers.*] When the right hon. Gentleman brought in the Act he evidently did not know the hardships it would inflict. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): What is 20 years' purchase at £19,000 a year? [*Ministerial cries of* "Order!"] Why, £400,000.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: As a matter of average that was so. But he was taking a concrete case. It was a question of fact. It was all very well to ask what would happen on the law of average.

*SIR H. FOWLER: The law prohibits it being more than 25 years purchase.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: That is on gross income. Gross income is a totally different thing. [*Cheers.*] The Succession Duty of £50,000 in the case he was considering involved a charge on the owner of property, which must be paid out of income, of eight instalments of £6,000 a year each. He had also to pay in the form of charges to younger children and others—who had a life interest in the property chargeable with duty and aggregated with what he received—£3,500 a year. This deducted from the total income left him £9,500 a year as available income. Out of this he had to pay £100,000 in Death Duties. According to the right hon. Gentleman it would be easy to pay that in eight instalments of £12,000 a year each. [*Cheers.*] The right hon. Gentleman was a distinguished financier, and if he could show how eight instalments of £12,000 a year could be paid out of an income of £9,500 he would eclipse the financial feats he had previously attempted. He submitted that on a concrete case he had absolutely proved that it was impossible for the owner of this property to pay this duty by instalments, but owing to the exigencies of the case and the enormous amount of duty, he must borrow the money and pay it in a lump sum. The right hon. Gentleman, however, actually stated that the fact that it was paid as a lump sum showed it did not gall his shoulders. A letter from the owner of the property said:—

> "I think we should be quite safe in putting the number of employés whom I have been obliged to discharge from Rufford, because I cannot find money to pay them, down at 40. A very large number of these are married men with families, and the misery is very great, especially among the old ones, who feel it will be very difficult to obtain employment elsewhere."

Everyone would allow that among the glories of England were the country houses and the amenities of country life, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite had done a great deal to destroy those amenities. [*Cheers.*] Another gentleman wrote that he was reduced almost to beggary by the Death Duties. He had reduced his personal expenses to a minimum. He travelled third class, and it was only by discharging old servants that he could find the money. He refused to take the responsibility, and would not pay the duty. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer proceeded against him, these old servants would know that it was not of his own free will that he discharged them. ["Hear, hear!"] In what cases did these particular duties fall with extreme hardship? He would quote the prophetic words of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, uttered when the Budget was introduced in 1894:—

> "In cases of lineal descent, the new Estate Duty will cover the Succession Duty. But where estates do not descend lineally, Succession Duty will be exacted *plus* the Estate Duty. That will impose an enormous additional burden upon estates of the kind I allude to (agricultural estates). It is no sufficient answer to say that these estates will only be calculated on their fair marketable value. When you have property in the country reduced to such a point as I have described, any additional burden is infinitely more killing than it is on property of larger value. It will simply ruin the holders of that property."

The case he himself had quoted bore out that contention. The right hon Gentleman further said:—

> "In my opinion, that increase of the Death Duties ought not to be made. In the circumstances of the moment it will be grossly unfair upon the owners of agricultural land."

This bore particularly on the point that, in certain individual cases, excessive hardship would fall on the owners of property owing to their having to pay on two separate scales, and on the highest scale in each instance. There must be certain cases where, both on the hereditary scale for succession duty and on the graduation scale according to the value of the property for estate duty, properties came under the highest scale for both; and in these cases it was so punishing that it ruined the holder of the property. Before these duties were imposed in 1894 the amount of duty which realty paid in proportion to personalty was one-tenth. Now it was one-fifth. That double amount represented a larger proportion than the true value of realty as compared with personalty in this country.

*SIR H. FOWLER: It includes house property.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: Certainly. What answer would he receive about these hardships of which he had spoken? He would be told, in regard to settlements, that estate duty was only payable once in a settlement, and that this was such a large relief to that class of property that it had no particular right to complain. The right hon. Gentleman said when he brought in the Budget of 1894, and speaking of the additional 1 per cent. settlement duty, "in this manner we levy the same amount on the estate as if left absolutely." Therefore, that is to say, that the 1 per cent. is calculated as an absolute monetary equivalent for the duty which it has escaped, owing to the property only paying once in a settlement. So it cannot be set up as equivalent for want of equalisation or anything else. They would be told that the income tax relief given under the Budget, and the relief given under the Agricultural Rating Bill last Session were an equivalent for these particular duties. He maintained that the relief given was not one iota more—it was considerably less—than the fair proportion agricultural land should pay of these particular taxes without reference to Death Duties. That, he believed, was common to all who had studied the question from an agricultural point of view. The one could not be held up as compensation for the other. He regarded this relief in relation to the Death Duties as relief on the henwife principle. What he meant was that it was as if a henwife excused herself to the fowl, whose neck she was about to wring, by reminding it of what a good meal she had recently given to the inhabitants of the poultry yard. He regretted that an Amendment to enable the owner of life interest in real estate to transfer it without becoming liable to duty just as the owner of property in fee could transfer it, which he had put upon the Paper last Session, and which had been postponed in consideration of an undertaking then given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pay the costs of both parties in a suit to determine the present state of the law on this point and other Amendments relating to the Death Duties, had been ruled out of order, because the Budget Resolution to amend the law relating to was founded did not contain the usual Resolutions to amend the law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue. Many regarded the present as an opportune time to ventilate the subject, and it was hoped the Amendments would have been discussed and judged on their merits. He did not know whether the difficulty could by any means be got over, but if it could, he was sure it would be the wish of the House it should be. Had this not occurred, he should not have needed to refer to particular Amendments now on Second Reading, but as the Amendments could not now be put down he would ask the House to allow him shortly to refer to them. ["Hear, hear!"] He contended that some maximum should be imposed, and suggested that no property should pay more than 15 per cent. of its capital value under the Act within a period of 16½ years, that was, half a generation. The next point on which remedy was required was that of husband and wife. At present a husband and wife were regarded as the same and one unit for the income tax, but were regarded as separate for the payment of Death Duties. The next point was a very simple one, and related to insurance policies. If any person starved his income to insure against the duties, the sum received at death was liable to duty. He suggested that where an insurance was effected in the name of the Controller of Inland Revenue, no duty should be charged upon it. Again, hardships arose in respect to aggregation. Aggregation, when combined with graduation—and to graduation as a principle he did not object—inflicted the greatest hardship. If a large sum went to A, and only a small legacy to B, B had to pay on as high a scale as A. On what principle could that particular form of duty be defended? There had recently come under his notice the case of an old female servant who was left a house of the capital value of £226, and an annuity of £20 a year, and was required to pay £60 duty. There was hardship also in regard to valuation. If an owner of property chose to settle a sum of money upon a child on marriage, the Revenue Department insisted that for purposes of duty an actual valuation should be made on his entire property. Another point concerned agricultural property. The allowances made for outgoings were absolutely and entirely insufficient; 12½ per cent. was nothing approaching a fair estimate for the necessary outgoings. ["Hear, hear!"] The Chancellor of the Exchequer might say to him, "If I yield to you on these points, where should I get the money required?" One penny of the income tax now raised two millions sterling, and he very much doubted whether, if all the suggestions he had made were carried into effect, it would cost the Chancellor of the Exchequer so much as two millions. He felt that if he had an income, it was fair and just and right he should pay a proportion of that income to the maintenance of the State, and in proportion as that income was large, so he ought to pay a large share. But what he objected to was that under the form of these duties a heavy charge was made on an individual absolutely irrespective of the fact whether he had any income to pay it out of or not. Having shown these grievances, and suggested some remedies, he ventured to say that in this particular form of taxation the very maximum amount of hardship had been imposed on individuals with the minimum of result to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did not think it would be possible to impose a tax which could fall with greater hardship on individuals than this tax did. He did not like to accuse the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire of having imposed this tax with the object of injuring those who had to pay it, but he reminded the House of what the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary said only a few nights ago, when referring to the Workmen's Compensation Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said there were two kinds of social legislation, punitive and remedial. That remark applied also to taxation; there was punitive taxation and taxation which was levied as evenly as possible simply with the object of raising the money that the Chancellor of the Exchequer required. In the opinion of a large number of individuals, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire could not be exonerated from a desire to impose punitive taxation upon the landed classes. That, at any rate, was the impression made by speeches delivered by some of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters at the time the question was before the country. The Conservative Party had opposed the imposition of these duties, and now expected that some consideration would be given by this Government to the grievances he had enumerated. They admitted that last Session was one of stress and storm, but this year affairs were in a different position, and he and others would regret exceedingly if this opportunity could not be taken, of, at any rate, reviewing the situation. The Secretary for the Colonies, speaking in that House on the 13th of this month, said:—

> "When it is a matter of justice a small number of people have as much right to consideration as a large number."

They believed that a reconsideration of these matters was a matter of justice, and it was as a matter of justice that he ventured to commend it to the attention of the House. [*Cheers.*]

On the return of Mr. SPEAKER, after the usual interval,

MR. HARWOOD wished to explain a remark he made in the course of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet. He feared that his interruption might be misunderstood in particular in regard to the cotton trade. He did not wish to be understood as saying that the cotton trade was exceptionally prosperous. As one interested in the trade, it would have been distinctly unwise. What he did wish to impress on the House was that the argument the right hon.Gentleman (Mr. James Lowther) was using, that the cotton trade was declining, was illusive. When he said that the trade had certainly improved, he referred to no particular district, but to the whole trade generally. The right hon. Gentleman drew pathetic pictures of mills being dismantled and machinery being removed. Such cases, of course, had occurred in every large trade or business that did not keep abreast with the times; but to mention isolated cases of that kind proved nothing in regard to the general condition of a trade as a whole. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured, if he might say so, to perform the operation of putting salt on a bird's tail by asking if he would recommend anyone to invest money in the cotton trade. As one interested in the trade, it would, of course, be suicidal in him to give such advice. He might be perfectly prepared to invest his own money, and the very reason why he should invest his own would be a reason why he should not advise anyone else to do the same. Had the right hon. Gentleman been in his place, he should have liked to invite him to pay a visit to Manchester, the centre of the world's cotton trade. He should be only too happy to introduce him to the Exchange, and secure him an audience; and he was sure that, whilst his unvarying humour was nowhere more appreciated than in Lancashire, his economic theories would suggest to his listeners the idea that he was a sort of economic icthyosaurus, or whatever other extinct animal he would like to be compared with. The notion that the cotton trade was languishing was absurd. Even the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion that the cotton trade was not so prosperous recently was a proof of the soundness of the fiscal system under which the country had been lately governed. The extraordinary prosperity of the trade years ago attracted more capital than could be absorbed with profit, and the consequence was that a time of prosperity was followed by a time of comparative adversity. But these large increments of capital were now being absorbed, and the trade was gradually getting steadily prosperous ; and it was, again, another instance of the soundness of the fiscal system under which we were governed. He would not attempt to follow the argument of the hon. Member who last spoke as to the Death Duties. He was not responsible in any way for that legislation, and he would not pretend to criticise its details or answer the hon. Gentleman's objections; but what he wished to impress on the hon. Member and on the House was that those who were connected with manufactures, and represented large populations had a firm conviction that the land had not borne its fair share of the national expenditure. The hon. Member said that they wanted justice. He considered that they were having justice, and that the injustice was to be found in the condition preceding this last arrangement with regard to the Death Duties. His opinion—and he knew it was shared by great numbers of the population on both sides of politics—was that under any arrangement, whatever Parliament did, the land always became ultimately the greatest beneficiaire in the prosperity and security of the country. Take, for example, the expenditure on the Army and Navy, necessary and right as it was. Who was it that, after all, benefited most by that expenditure? It was the owners of real property. Personal property was transitory; it melted away; it could be moved. But real property was the one item in the national estate which benefited most by strengthening the Army and Navy and preserving the integrity and safety of the realm; and they in the manufacturing towns held that a fair share of the expenditure on the defensive forces of the country had not hitherto been borne by those who had derived the chief benefit from it. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not, however, rise so much in regard to this matter, as he wished to call the attention of the House—and particularly that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—to an inference from a remark which fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet, a remark which in substance had been made very frequently during the Debates on this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that they had to raise an income of 112 millions, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the most interesting speech in which he introduced the Bill, told the House that they had to raise an income of £109,750,000. He called the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the fact that what the right hon. Gentleman called his final balance sheet was drawn up on principles of unsound book-keeping. What the majority of the people in the country meant by national expenditure was expenditure on national objects, but not on objects which were purely matters of private business. What he objected to was the inclusion of the item for the Post Office and Telegraph Services, which was not national expenditure in the ordinary sense, but private business. The same observation applied to the Suez Canal shares, the profit of which only was shown; but what they wanted was to see what they were spending and receiving as a nation.

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that if a change had been made in the wording of the Amendment, he would have been able to vote for it, but as submitted by the right hon. Gentleman he could only render it moral support. The right hon. Gentleman contemplated supplying the Chancellor of the Exchequer with more money, and he offered to give the public a present of 4½ millions at the price of levying a tax upon them of 11 or 12 millions. On the other hand, he, in opposition to the right hon. Gentleman, wanted economy introduced into the national finances. Our expenditure at present was monstrous; it was growing too rapidly. He thought that there were 17 subjects of taxation at present, but the main subjects were only four or five. Personally, he did not want a large number; he thought there might be eight. The broad principle on which he supported the right hon. Gentleman was this. When they had only a few subjects of taxation the taxes were levied on the poor people. The more the number was extended the more they caught the rich. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech took the case of a poor man in 1837 and a poor man in 1897, and he showed the difference in the pressure of taxation which had taken place in that period. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that nearly all the change that had taken place had been effected by increasing the tax on property. He had had an interesting calculation upon that statement sent him by a correspondent, who pointed out that, although the tax on property had increased, the total increase since 1837 was only £29,000,000, while the increase of the taxes paid by the poorer classes was £27,500,000. The three subjects taken in this calculation were beer, spirits, and tobacco. In 1837 the total amount raised by the duties on these three articles was £16,000,000, whilst in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget the amount was put at £43,750,000. That in itself showed that the national revenue was not levied entirely at present, or, indeed, as far as it ought to be, on the increase of taxes on property. Whereas in England in 1837 the poor would have paid 12s. 8d. per head, in Ireland at the same time the taxes would only have amounted to 4s. 10d. per head. But after 60 years, whilst in England the poor man instead of 12s. 8d. paid only 7s. 4d., a great decrease, the poor man in Ireland paid 7s. 7d., or a substantial increase. The change, therefore, had not been equal all over the country, and had pressed not only on Ireland, but the change that had taken place in the spirit duty had pressed very hard on Scotland as well.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said he did not think the hon. Gentleman's figures were correct, and he was bringing into the calculation articles which he did not bring in at all in the comparison he made. The articles he alluded to in his Budget statement bore the same rate of duty in England as in Ireland.

MR. LOUGH accepted the correction, but said that, at any rate, in the three articles he had referred to, there had been this growth in the tax. His point, therefore, was that a great part of the increase of taxation during the 60 years had been paid by the very poor. He could not follow the right hon. Member for Thanet in his proposal to put a duty on corn, which would make the poor man pay more in taxation than he did at present. A duty of 5s. per quarter on corn instead of increasing the selling price by half-a-crown, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, would increase it by double the amount of the duty, for the consumer would not only have to pay the net amount the Chancellor of the Exchequer levied, but a large profit on that amount as well. Instead of putting a tax on bread he would suggest as subjects for taxation silk, cider, and perry. Cider and perry were taxed until 1825 and 1830, when the tax was taken off because they were intoxicants used by the English and not by the Scotch and Irish. The right hon. Member for Thanet had recommended that a duty should be placed on all manuactured goods brought into this country, but he was of opinion that such a system would do a great deal of harm. With regard to the Finance Bill itself, it was so simple that it was difficult to criticise it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer showed that he had preserved a balance of £500,000 for contingencies. That, he submitted, was far too much. Again, with the large surplus he had the right hon. Gentleman should have made some attempt to deal with what were known as the small breakfast-table duties. Altogether, he thought a considerable reduction of taxation might have been made this year if there had been any inclination in that direction.

*SIR HERBERT MAXWELL (Wigtownshire) said all who had experience of county constituencies in 1895 could testify how general and strong was the anticipation that the injustice done to real property in 1894 would be dealt with as soon as the Unionist Party were returned to power. At that time, as his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the Woodbridge Division had shown, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed the opinion that the new Death Duties would under a certain combination of circumstances prove the ruin of owners of that class of property.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I distinctly stated to my constituents, and it was published throughout the country during the General Election of 1895, that, the Death Duties having been enacted, it appeared to me impossible to repeal them or to alter them in any material form.

*SIR H. MAXWELL could assure his right hon. Friend that he did not wish to appear as an unfriendly critic. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: "You are!"] He had no wish to adopt an unfriendly attitude towards the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the last interruption seemed distinctly unfriendly towards himself. He ventured to say that the views which the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed in 1894 in that House were much more widely known and deeply taken to heart by the constituencies than any he confided to his constituents in Bristol in 1895. The Leader of the other wing of the Unionist Party, the Duke of Devonshire, delivered at Buxton, on June 14, 1894, a speech which attracted widespread attention. In that speech the Duke spoke of the "enormous exactions" imposed by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer on those succeeding to landed property, which, he said, would bring about a great change in the manner in which the incomes derived from the Devonshire estates should be expended. Naturally that speech excited not unreasonable anticipations of what the policy of the Unionist Party would be should they return to power. Now, approaching, as they were, the end of the second year during which the present Government had been in office, it did not seem unreasonable that large numbers of persons throughout the country should look for some fulfilment of those expectations, which, rightly or wrongly, were founded on the action of Her Majesty's present advisers while they were in Opposition. The relief afforded in the Budget of last year to owners of valuable works of art did not touch the far wider and deeper interests of those dependent on the land for their income. In a well-known phrase, the right hon. Member for Montrose had said:—

> "Rest assured that taxation, however spread, however disguised, falls eventually on the shoulders of the industrial classes."

And the crippling of those who held the land by the imposition of undue burdens must affect those who were dependent on them. There were many hon. Members opposite who hailed with frank satisfaction anything tending to weaken the landlords. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] Such sentiments had many times been frankly stated from the Benches opposite. But hon. Gentlemen who held those views ought to remember that, in striking at the landlords, who were comparatively few in number, they were wounding tens of thousands behind the landlords. ["Hear, hear!"] The Duke of Bedford—one of the largest landowners in England—had lately published a statement as to the revenues of his estates. He showed that on the two properties—Woburn and Oakley—comprising 51,600 acres, the expenditure from 1816 to 1895 had been about £4,230,500; and that after excluding all expenditure on Woburn Abbey, its park and farm, there was at present an annual loss of £7,000 on those estates; while the Death Duties on them were estimated at £65,000. If that was the result on one of the largest properties in England, it could not be considered that landlords were altogether selfish in protesting against the incidence of these Death Duties. He had recently heard of a property in the south-west of Scotland which had been in the possession of the same family from the time of the Celtic chiefs. That family had supplied many public servants to the State, many of them had occupied seats both in this House and in the Scottish Parliament before the Union. They had resided constantly on their estates, and fulfilled the ideal of country gentlemen. The gross rental was about £13,000 a year; and, the owner dying last year, the heir had to pay in Death Duties £32,000—equal to at least five years' net income from the estate. The result was that the heir was plunged into debt, and, for the very first time in the history of the property, it had to be advertised to let for sporting purposes. He might be told that the heir could sell, but what class would benefit by a forced sale? And he had yet to learn that the Conservative Party identified itself with the view that it was better for property to pass out of the hands of those who had had it so long. If the Government really sought to anticipate the end of the present land system in this country, then it must be a question with himself and others how far they would follow them in that policy. [*Cheers.*] For many years he had been an active Member of the Conservative Party. For 17 years he had been a Member of the House of Commons, and for six years he had held office under a Conservative Prime Minister; and he was loth to believe that the Unionist Party had adopted this unfriendly attitude to the landed interest. If they had not, but believed that, on the whole, the ownership of land as understood and practised in Great Britain had tended to the welfare and advancement of all classes connected with the land, then he urged the Government to consider what means could be taken to relieve that system from burdens which in the end must prove intolerable, and to protect it from impending dissolution. He hoped to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer adopt in 1897 or 1898 some policy which was more in harmony with the views which he and his colleagues had professed in Opposition in 1894. [*Cheers.*]

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Mr. Speaker, before I allude to the general question raised by the Amendment my right hon. Friend has moved, I should like shortly to refer to the charge made against me by the hon. Member for Bolton, whom I do not now see in his place. The hon. Member referred to the mode in which the Budget accounts were presented to Parliament; and he suggested that it would be more business-like and more in accordance with what he called proper book keeping, if in future I entered in those accounts the net receipts from such services as the Post Office and the telegraphs, in place of entering on one side the expenditure and on the other the gross receipts. The hon. Member is ignorant of the fact that in 1854 Parliament, by an Act passed at the instance of Mr. Gladstone, deliberately provided for its own advantage and for the information of the country, that the statement of accounts should be furnished just as they are now. ["Hear, hear!"] It is, therefore, not in my power, without disobedience to the law, to carry out the suggestion the hon. Member has made, which, in my opinion, would be a serious disadvantage to Parliament and to the public, and which would not enable a fair account of the expenditure and revenue of the country to be presented. ["Hear, hear!"] I have found myself in this Debate in what I suppose is the invariable position of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have had to suffer more than once during the past Session for what has been called a disposition to too great economy. [*Laughter.*] Even on the very Bill that preceded this Bill this evening, there was more than one speaker who complained that, owing to my parsimony, an insufficient sum had been provided for the necessitous Board Schools of England; and I cannot but repeat, in reply to the hon. Member for Islington, the statement which I ventured to make in introducing the Budget, that the great spending department of this country now is the House of Commons itself. ["Hear, hear!"] But while expenditure is demanded from all quarters of the House for almost every conceivable object, I am in the unenviable position of being grudged taxes wherewith to meet those demands. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] I will admit that my right hon. Friend the Member for Thanet does not grudge me taxes.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: No; I would give you some more. [*Laughter.*]

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: But my right hon. Friend does not intend to devote them to expenditure. Under his well-known theories that Protection would be the best policy for this country, he invites me to repeal the tea duties, to levy a 5s. duty on corn, to levy duty on all manufactured goods, which, I think, he would find it impossible to define—["hear, hear!"]—for the great proportion of what he would call our manufactured imports are goods which are further manufactured when they arrive in this country—["hear, hear!"]—and, having given me additional revenue in that way, he proposes to devote it, not to expenditure, but to the repeal of existing direct taxation either in the way of income tax or Death Duties. I do not wish to follow my right hon. Friend into the controversy between Protection and Free Trade. He did not dwell on that this evening. I know he believes we are rapidly going down the hill. I know he believes that other countries are, owing to their policy of protection, able to compete with us on much more favourable terms; that our pre-eminence as a manufacturing country is ebbing; that we are lagging behind; and that the relative progress of other countries is greater than ours owing to their different fiscal systems. To my mind, the very fact of the enormous revenue that is raised by the present system of taxation is an answer to that charge. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not wish to weary the House, but I could go into statistics as to the comparative trade of the United Kingdom and of our great neighbours, France, Germany, and Italy, for a period of ten years which would show, first, that we have an enormous preponderance over any other country in the bulk of our trade; secondly, that the fall in prices may have been rather a source of profit than of loss to this country, because it has been a fall in prices, not only of the manufactures which we export, but of the raw materials which we import—["hear, hear!"]—and, thirdly, that although the actual value of trade may have diminished, it has diminished less in this country than in other countries. ["Hear, hear!"] I could still further show, in answer to my right hon. Friend's comparison of our imports with our exports, that not only do we receive an enormous advantage from our foreign investments coming back to us in the shape of imports, but also that we are, in fact, the carriers of the world, and that from our shipping, which amounts, I think, to half that of the whole world, we receive what is an enormous amount, equal to 100 millions a year, to pay for the import trade of this country. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not quite understand what is the object of my right hon. Friend. As I think

I have already shown, our existing fiscal system is equal to the present demands. Of course, it may be argued that the distribution of our taxation is unfair, that direct taxes should be abolished and indirect taxes substituted, or *vice versâ;* but I say our system of taxation is at present equal to the demand. ["Hear, hear!"] But I entirely admit, in answer to my right hon. Friend, that I do not wish to draw back in any way from what I said last year. I do think that the narrow basis of our present system of taxation may become a source of danger. In the event of a period of serious depression of trade, or, of course, much more in the event of a great war—if we should be so unfortunate as to incur it—we should have to seek for other sources of revenue besides those from which we at present draw—["hear, hear!"]—and, as I said last year, I do not envy the task of the Chancellor of the Exchequer who has to make such a search. I am not at all prepared to say that our present system of taxation, whether direct or indirect, is infallible. I am not at all prepared to say that we might not make some changes, by additional taxation upon articles now subject to taxation, by reducing taxation upon articles now subject to taxation, or by introducing additional articles into our system of taxation, which might be to the public advantage. All I say is that I am satisfied with the present system so far as the present needs are concerned. Now, the hon. Member for the City of Derry suggested that another change should be made in our system of indirect taxation; he suggested the inclusion of some articles, such as silk, within the list of dutiable articles, which, I think he would find, if he went into the matter, would not produce anything like an amount which would counterbalance the inconvenience of placing them on the Customs list. But he also made a much larger suggestion; he suggested a system of *ad valorem* duties in place of our existing system of indirect taxation. Now, Sir, the system of *ad valorem* duties was, if I may say so, knocked on the head by Mr. Gladstone, I think, in the year 1860. ["Hear, hear!"] He pointed out—I believe it was in a Budget speech—with, I think unanswerable force, how the system of *ad valorem* duties was a most injurious interference with the freedom of trade, how it vexed and worried all those who were concerned in trade with minute and difficult restrictions which were much more felt by them than an increase in the duty on the articles which were subject to duty. He also pointed out that it was a very important element in our system of indirect taxation that the revenue should be easy of collection, and that a system of *ad valorem* duties materially interfered with the facility of collection. I certainly am not prepared—plausible though the suggestion may be that it would be better to levy a higher duty on the more valuable articles—to go back to a system of *ad valorem* duties. [*Cheers.*] But, Sir, the principal event in this evening's Debate has been the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for the Woodbridge Division of Suffolk. ["Hear, hear!"] If he will permit me, I would like to say that I have seldom listened to a speech in this House with greater pleasure; it dealt with a most difficult and complicated subject, a subject which, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite knows, and I know, is one of the driest with which anyone can be called upon to deal, with a lucidity, eloquence, and ability which I think it would be very difficult to surpass. ["Hear, hear!"] I have no word to say in complaint of my hon. Friend's references to myself on this matter, and, of course, it is not for me to defend the right hon. Gentleman who sits opposite. I was an opponent, as is very well known, of the Finance Act of 1894; I opposed the increase then made to the Death Duties on two grounds—first, because I objected to an increase of Imperial taxation on real property without something being done to relieve real property, and especially agricultural land, from the burden of rates; and, secondly, I objected to the indefinite provisions of the Finance Act of 1894 with regard to the valuation of agricultural land for the purpose of the Death Duties. I think the right hon. Gentleman opposite will bear me out in saying that throughout the discussions on that Bill those were the two grounds on which I based my objection to it, and practically when it was found impossible to induce him to meet us on the first point, and when on the second point he had accepted the Amendment of my right hon. Friend the present Leader of the House, I no longer argued against the principle of the Bill. Subsequently, both in public and in private, and in speeches which certainly have been reported and which are pretty well known, I consistently maintained that so great a change in the system of Death Duties having been once established by Parliament, it could not be repealed or altered in its material particulars unless it was shown to fail in the object which it was intended to achieve. In my judgment, Sir, there were points in regard to which the Act of 1894 required amendment. I examined those points very carefully last year, and I carried through Parliament certain alterations in it. Another point of very great importance to which my hon. Friend the Member for the Woodbridge Division (Captain Pretyman) referred, is the question of the power of the owner of a life estate to free the property from Death Duty by giving away his life interest during his life. As the House is aware, I have consented on behalf of the Treasury to bear the cost of a test action to show what the law is, and that action, I believe, is now pending. I do not agree with, at any rate, some of the criticisms which my hon. Friend passed on the Finance Act of 1894. He said that it had not decreased the complications of the law relating to Death Duty. Well, Sir, I do not know that any law could decrease those complications. It doubtless, on account of the magnitude of the charge which was made, increased those complications for a considerable period after it became law, and even now the office concerned has hardly arrived at complete working order. There have been delays which are a very fair subject of complaint, but I think in future those delays will be corrected. Then my hon. Friend said that millionaires had not been caught as was intended by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Well, Sir, that is not my experience. [*Laughter.*] I think I have shown to the House this year and last year that the millionaires had been very considerably caught—["hear, hear!"]—and I was very glad to hear my hon. Friend say he did not object to the millionaires being caught, because I confess I have never had very much sympathy with millionaires in this matter. ["Hear, hear!"] Then he further said that the position of realty and personalty had not been equalised. Well, you cannot entirely equalise in fact the position of realty and personalty. Some of the points which my hon. Friend alluded to in regard to this were, I think, very fair ones, but I maintain that last year we did a great deal to carry out the views which I expressed when the Finance Act of 1894 was under discussion as to the relief which ought to be given to agricultural land from rating in consequence of its being placed on an equality with personalty under the Death Duties. I thought, I confess, that the grant from the Exchequer of £1,330,000 a year, as it has proved to be, in relief of the rates on agricultural land, was a material concession, and I was rather disappointed that my hon. Friend this evening should refer to it as a very small matter. My hon. Friend referred to cases of hardship which had been caused by the Finance Act of 1894, and he quoted one which has, to some extent, come under my own observation. But, not knowing the case would be referred to, I have not had time to verify the facts. He referred to the Rufford estate, and gave figures showing that enormous sums had been paid by the several owners during the last 15 years by way of Death Duties. He spoke of it as an instance of an agricultural estate. I do not think it is quite fairly described as an agricultural estate. I am not personally acquainted with it, but I am informed that its total value, although the acreage is not large, is something like £1,000,000,and that value is mainly due to mineral or building rights. But, however that may be, the facts are these. The estate belonged to a nobleman who died in 1844, having entailed it upon his four illegitimate sons one after another and their issue. If he had wanted to hand over to the State by way of Death Duty as large a proportion of the value of the estate as was possible, he could not have taken a better course. Each of the sons being strangers in blood had to pay 10 per cent. succession duty, and the other day the present owner had to pay 10 per cent. succession duty because he inherited, not from his own father, but from the original settlor, and will have to pay a large sum by way of estate duty. I do not know how much it is, because I think the figures are not settled, but I do not think it can be as much as was suggested. But the bulk of the Death Duties paid on the estate is in no way due to the Finance Act of 1894. [*Opposition cheers.*] It is due to the old law passed in 1853, under which succession duty is payable by strangers in blood at the rate of 10 per cent.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Capital value now; not life interest.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: That depends on the interest taken in the estate. If only a life interest were taken, succession duty would only be paid on the life interest. The bulk of the sum paid and payable on the Rufford estate has been due to the succession duty. No doubt a large sum will be payable by way of estate duty. But then it must be remembered that the estate is worth £1,000,000. [*Opposition cheers.*] I confess I have thought—not that it was possible to do anything which would place illegitimate children on any other footing than that of strangers in blood, because that would involve other serious alterations in the law—but that when the right hon. Gentleman, in the case of lineals, allowed succession duty or legacy duty to merge in the estate duty, he hardly went far enough. There may be ground for considering whether with regard to legacy and succession duty, in the case of those who are not lineals, there is not hardship under the present law—at any rate, in the case of brothers and sisters—and I will undertake to examine the matter and see what can be done. Generally on this subject I was very reluctant last year to deal with amendments of the Death Duties, because I felt that in attempting to relieve hardships, I might be inflicting worse hardships. The matter is so complicated that it is only with the greatest care that any change can be made. I admit that the Amendments required may not have been exhausted by the legislation of last year. There may be other points not affecting the main principle of the Act or leading to anything like a repeal of it which ought in fairness to be dealt with, and I promise they shall have my attention. My hon. Friend suggested changes which might cost something like £2,000,000 a year. How is that to be found? [Captain PRETYMAN: "A penny on the income tax!"] What he had in his mind may have been only the transfer of the burden from Death Duties to a penny in the income tax on property now subject to Death Duties. But that would be a matter of extreme difficulty. If you put a penny on the income tax all round you would tax trade in order to relieve realised property. [*Opposition cheers.*] I do not think that is a proposal I should like to submit to the House of Commons. For the present I have only to ask the House to deal with the Motion. I hope they will not consent to the Amendment of my hon. Friend, which I believe he is not anxious to press to a Division. If it means anything, it means the substitution of Protection for our present Free Trade system. If there be any truth in his pessimistic opinion as to the future of this country, I can only say that I believe by such substitution our fall would be certainly sooner and greater than it would be under our present system. [*Cheers.*]

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: To-night we have on the Paper two Amendments in the names of two most distinguished supporters of the Government. My right hon. Friend the Member for Thanet has an Amendment which, if carried, would destroy the Government and their financial proposals, and that Amendment is founded upon the proposition to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has already called attention, viz., that "the existing fiscal system of this country is unequal to the continually increasing demands of the public service, and that the time has arrived for recourse being had to more varied sources of taxation." Last year the existing fiscal system of the country produced an unexpected surplus of £5,000,000, and this year a still more unexpected surplus of about £3,000,000, and that is the condition of things in which my right hon. Friend states that the fiscal system of the country is unequal to the continually increasing demands of the public service. [*Laughter.*] That does not commend itself logically to my mind. The conclusion I should have arrived at is that the time had arrived, not for an increase, but for a diminution of the sources of taxation—

["hear, hear!"]—and if I have any fault to find with the financial arrangements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it would be that he has not drawn that conclusion in the manner I should have expected. So much for the first attack on the Government from their own supporters. Then comes the speech of the hon. Member for the Woodbridge Division of Suffolk, and I desire to associate myself with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the well-deserved compliment he has paid to him. ["Hear, hear!"] There is no pleasure greater than to see the younger Members of the House come forward with such distinction as he has gained. [*Cheers.*] I myself was the principal victim of the hon. Member's attack, yet I fully share the sentiments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but what was the conclusion at which the hon. Gentleman arrived? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet arrived at the conclusion that we were to have a 5s. duty on corn, which, of course, would be a satisfaction to the agricultural interest. He was of opinion that a 5s. duty on corn would mean an increase of 20 per cent. in rents.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I suggested a sliding scale.

*SIR W. HARCOURT: I am glad the right hon. Gentleman is aware of the existence of a sliding scale, because in the course of his speech he gave some curious figures with reference to the corn duties in the earlier part of the century. The basis of that sliding scale was that there should be a minimum price of 80s. a quarter, but the time came when people were more enligtened, and some 20 years afterwards it was admitted that the agricultural interest could exist at a minimum of 60s. a quarter. ["Hear, hear!"] Well, that is the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman for the benefit of the agricultural interest; but then the Member for Suffolk concluded his speech with a proposal that the agricultural interest should be relieved from the unjust burden under which they suffered by the addition of a penny to the income tax. [*Laughter.*] That was to produce £2,000,000, to be devoted to the relief of the agricultural interest. When you combine these two proposals you get, I think, £5,000,000 from the hon. Member for Thanet, £2,000,000 from the Member for Suffolk, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as he has already told us, has given them £1,500,000. That makes £8,500,000, which is the combined proposal of them all for the relief of the agricultural interest at the expense of the other interests of the country. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] Of course, the burden of the 5s. duty on corn would fall on the consuming class, or the poorer and wage-earning class. The proposal of the Member for Suffolk is that the £2,000,000 should fall on the industrial and professional classes for the relief of the agricultural interest.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: I did not say the agricultural interest particularly. I said that business and trade suffered as well.

*SIR W. HARCOURT: I thought the argument was confined to the agricultural interest, but now the hon. Gentleman says it will also go in relief of the millions. Then comes the paltry contribution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has given £1,500,000 to the agricultural ratepayer and nothing to the urban ratepayer. I do not intend to-night to join the band of persecutors of Her Majesty's Government, but if the House would allow me I should like to make a few brief remarks on the general aspect of the Budget. I join the Chancellor of the Exchequer in congratulating the House and the country on the immense revenue it is possible to raise under the existing system of taxation. ["Hear, hear!"] With reference to the Budget accounts, I agree that the present system is the right one—that you ought to show all the receipts on one side and all the expenditure on the other. That is exactly the complaint we have always made with reference to the system of accounts unfortunately introduced some years ago in dealing with local taxation. I admit that in consequence of our remonstrances the Chancellor of the Exchequer has greatly improved these accounts, because he shows for the first time on the official paper how much of the Imperial revenue is given to local taxation, instead of keeping it out of the account, as it had been kept out before. I was also happy to hear in his Budget speech that he always spoke of the Imperial revenue as the whole revenue, and not as revenue excluding from it that part which under the unfortunate phrase interception had been kept out of the account, and given to local taxation. In order that we should understand this thing we should speak of it as it is. The Imperial revenue of this country is not the £104,000,000 which goes into the Exchequer; it is the £112,000,000 which is raised by your taxation, of which you give away £9,000,000 to local taxation. ["Hear, hear!"] And it is not merely £9,000,000 which is given to local taxation in that form; there is also £3,000,000 on the Votes in Supply which goes in aid of local taxation, so that at this moment out of Imperial revenue local taxation receives £12,000,000. That is the actual fact, and people ought to get it clearly into their minds; and it is due only to the former confusion of the public accounts that that has not been thoroughly understood. I hope in the future the Chancellor of the Exchequer will complete the reform and bring in these local taxation contributions as what they are—as money collected as Imperial revenue and handed over as a subsidy to local taxation. I rejoice, and I think everybody ought to rejoice, in the immense yield of the present system of taxation. I entirely agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it is a proof, a most signal proof, that the financial system of this country is founded on a sound fiscal and commercial basis, and also upon a sound basis of currency—[*cheers*]—which has made this country the principal commercial nation of the world, and the money market also for all quarters of the globe. Customs have increased. What does that prove? It proves that the wages of the people are good. The income tax has improved to an extraordinary degree. I rejoice especially in that, because, though it was my duty to increase the income tax, I introduced large allowances in the tax. I remember the First Lord of the Admiralty—I do not say unjustly—expressed his fear that that might interfere with the framework and the security of the income tax, which is one of the great pillars of the revenue. What has happened? These allowances have no doubt been a great relief to the humbler payers of the income tax, and yet so great has been the prosperity of the country that the loss, which amounted to £1,500,000 upon these allowances, has been recouped since by the increase of the tax. That included, no doubt, the allowance under Schedule A, for which the hon. Member for Suffolk said, "No, thank you." He was willing enough to accept the reduction and the relief to the agricultural interest, which amounted to £200,000 under Schedule A; but now he says, "I don't count that; that was our due anyhow." But what used to be the old argument? The old argument was—You pay higher under Schedule A because you do not pay probate duty. I set to work to equalise the two, and it was found that the one was much larger than the other. Of course, when the relief under Schedule A was given it was given in consequence of the redress of the inequality under the probate duty. The income tax shows the increase of the profits of the country. What does the increase in the Death Duties show? That evidences the increase of the accumulated wealth of the country. [*Cheers.*] The hon. Member for Suffolk talked of these duties being evaded, and says, "You don't get hold of the millionaires." Then where does that increase of £4,000,000 come from? Who pays that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Realty.

*SIR W. HARCOURT: Did the hon. Member read the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech? Out of £14,000,000 paid in Death Duties, what did the agricultural interest pay?—£800,000. [*Laughter and cheers.*] The increase of Customs is remarkable. The Chancellor of the Exchequer estimates his Customs' receipts for the coming year at £21,500,000. Now, that is nearly £2,000,000 more than the average that has been raised by Customs for the last 15 years. It has been a standing rule of Chancellors of the Exchequer one after another that when the Customs have reached the point of £20,000,000 there has always been a relief to indirect taxation under the head of Customs. It was done in reference to the tobacco duty. It was done by the First Lord of the Admiralty in respect to the tea duty. You have now got indirect taxation under Customs really £2,000,000 higher than has been the average levied upon the people of this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer reckoned that there would be a great diminution of the stamp duties, and I think his calculation was reasonable enough. He thought the insane Stock Exchange boom in the Kaffir Circus could not continue, and he put down his estimate of receipts for stamps by £650,000. But he received exactly the same sum this year that he did last year; and why? He has told us this remarkable fact—that that £650,000 has been made up from the stamps upon the transfer of properties in consequence of the greater dealings in the transfer, especially of real property. That, I think, is a highly satisfactory state of things. What accounts for the permanent stability of the revenue is that it depends upon averages and not upon particular receipts. My valued Friend, Sir Alfred Milner, has often spoken of the law of average as being the deity that presides over the public revenue. In astronomical observations you may find errors in the instruments, but, after all, they correct one another, and so you will find when one source of revenue has fallen off another has increased. If you look upon the whole tide of the revenue you find it is flowing in the right direction, and you may neglect the fact that in particular cases there may be a falling off, because there will be a corresponding advantage in other cases. The growth of the income tax is extremely satisfactory. I do believe that by the relief that was given in 1894 to the lower classes of income tax payers you have strengthened the income tax, inasmuch as you have made it more tolerable to those who were the less able to pay it. But, in my opinion, an income tax of 8d. is too high —[" hear, hear! "]—in time of peace—if, indeed, we live in a time of peace. It is a burden which I am not disposed with the hon. Member for Suffolk to increase. [" Hear, hear! "] As to the Death Duty, let me say it is most remarkable how that duty has conformed to the original estimate. What was the estimate I presented to the House in 1894? I said that in the first year it would yield a million. It yielded £990,000, I think. I said that in future years it would yield between £3,500,000 and £4,000,000. Last year it yielded £50,000 above £4,000,000, and this year it has yielded about £50,000 under £4,000,000. That is a most remarkable conformity with the expectation formed. The hon. Member for King's Lynn, who I notice is absent, predicted not merely that we should not get anything in addition, but that we should lose even what we had, and he preached the doctrine, I will not call it of evasion, but of handsome and liberal avoidance. [*A laugh.*] But he preached it to deaf ears. Some people dispose of their property in that way, but still there always remains a good deal of human nature about man, and one of the qualities of human nature is that people like to keep possession of their property. [*A laugh.*] Some people do dispose of their property very much to the advantage of their younger friends. I hope the hon. Member for Suffolk has benefited by the system of avoidance and evasion. [*Laughter.*] Still there are many people, and quite as many as we ever expected, who stick by their own. Rather more do that than we expected, because part of our calculation was that when you impose a new tax or increase an old tax you will not get quite as much as you did from the lower taxation, that there always will be a leakage. All that formed an element in the calculation. I see no reason whatever to expect that things will be very different in the future. The Chancellor of the Exchequer mentioned that this last year there had been a diminution in the amount of free personalty, but that was the very thing that was pointed out in 1894-95 by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who said, " See, you have lost all this money by evasion." What happened the next year? It went up again and you got twice as much as you had lost before. This year you have lost again, but next year you may gain again. I am not, therefore, prepared to say that that is likely to be a continuing source of loss. The hon. Member for Suffolk referred to agricultural land. Let us see what agricultural land contributes to the death duty. Out of £14,000,000 personalty contributes £11,500,000 and realty £2,500,000, and that includes house property. How much does agricultural land contribute to the £14,000,000? £843,000. The hon. Member for Suffolk was rather indignant with me because I had referred to the fact that the owners of realty thought it more convenient to pay down on the nail than to pay by instalments, and he gave me credit, which I think was only just, that I had arranged these instalments because I thought it would facilitate the payment of the duty by the owners of real property. I was told that their land had mortgages on it; that they could not borrow, that they could not sell, and that it was impossible for the money to be raised. Therefore, I said, "Very well, let there be eight years to pay instalments." ["Hear, hear!"] Yes, but when the thing comes to be tested, £1,700,000 is paid in full and only £162,000 is paid in instalments. ["Hear, hear!"] That is one-tenth. Therefore, it is not true that the money could not be got. On the contrary, it is got, according to the hon. Member for Suffolk, with the greatest facility. The hon. Member gave the House as an illustration the case of a man who had £10,000 a year; his Death Duty was £13,000, and he borrowed it on mortgage at the cost of £500 a year; but I cannot see that a man who has an income of £10,000 a year for his mortgage, and has to pay £500 a year is doomed to everlasting ruin. The hon. Member also introduced the Rufford case, but the peculiarity of that case has been explained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He has shown, perfectly truly, that the result of the excessive burden in that case has nothing whatever to do with the legislation of 1894. ["Hear, hear!"] It is the commonest thing for people in society to say, "Oh that abominable Budget of 1894. Just think, a man has got to pay 10 per cent. here and 8 per cent. there." But the Budget of 1894 did not impose the 10 per cent. It existed before. It did not impose the 8 per cent., because of that 4 per cent. existed before. It is nobody but the millionaire who pays 8 per cent., and, therefore, the extent to which the Budget of 1894 altered the thing is the extent between 4 per cent. and 8 per cent. arising from the properties that already paid 4 per cent.; and when they get properties of £250,000 I think they pay 7 per cent., or 3 per cent. additional. And it is really said that men who leave a property of £100,000, because, under the provisions of the Act of 1894, they have to pay 1½ per cent. more than they did before, will make away with all their property and live in absolute want! The ignorance and exaggeration which have been applied to this case are really quite inconceivable, and the figures I have given, I venture to say, are absolutely true. What of these extraordinary ruins of which I hear so much, and of which, I am happy to say, amongst my friends I see so little—and many of them have succeeded to very considerable estates? I had a letter the other day from one whom I believe to be the very richest man in the country at the present day, and who always does me the favour, when a person of considerable estate dies, to write to me to call attention to his ruin. [*Laughter.*] He wrote to me the other day about the succession of a friend of mine—and a friend of everybody's in this House—to an estate. "Do you know," he said, "that so-and-so will have to pay £100,000 in death duty?" I wrote back and said,—

> "I am extremely glad to hear that my dear friend and yours will have to pay £100,000 in Death Duty, because that would not be possible unless his clear income was £50,000 a year; and I did not believe he was so well-off."

[*Laughter.*] When we hear of these things, do let me ask the hon. Member for Suffolk to take this as a rule, and I think he will find it works out pretty accurately—that the estate duty cannot in any case exceed two years' income. ["Oh!"] The hon. Member will find that is so. Let me give his own example. He gave the example of a man with £10,000 a year; and what was the sum he had to pay? According to the hon. Member £13,000, I think. That was not one-and-a-half years' income.

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: What I said was that this was estate duty only, and the particular hardship to which I referred was in a case when the extreme scale of succession duty and of estate duty fell on the same person. The case I quoted was of a man with £10,000 a year, and the £13,000 he would have to pay was estate duty only. I particularly said I did not consider the amount of the duty so much the hardship as the distribution of it by all falling upon a particular individual.

*SIR W. HARCOURT: I am only concerned to defend the estate duty. You may take it as a general rule that when you are dealing with largish properties the estate duties will not exceed one and a half year's income, and that when you come to the largest properties they will not exceed two years' income, and if you have eight instalments by which to pay you cannot be called upon for more than a quarter of your income in a year. Or if, as the hon. Member suggests, the money is borrowed on mortgage it will, of course, be very much less. It is, therefore, patent that many of the statements that have been made are exaggerations showing extreme ignorance. Let me come to the great grievance voiced by the hon. Member for Suffolk. He admits that what is paid by the agricultural interest is £843,000 out of £14,000,000. But at the time when this burden was imposed a relief was given under Schedule A of £200,000, reducing the burden to £600,000. Let me put before the House the profit and loss account. I take the £800,000. As against that the agricultural interest has received from myself a humble contribution of £200,000; it has received this year in rates from the Chancellor of the Exchequer £1,330,000, it received in land tax £100,000, making in all nearly £1,700,000. Therefore, upon the balance the agricultural interest is more than £800,000 to the good. The fact is that the agricultural industry has enjoyed such advantages in the past that when those who are interested in it find themselves placed upon the same footing as other people they regard themselves, as the hon. Member for Suffolk says, as the objects of punitive legislation. The hon. Member could not have desired to impute to me any malicious intention, because he knows that punitive legislation against the agricultural interest never entered my mind. Why should it be supposed that I desired to deal with that interest differently from other interests? My own personal prejudices were rather in favour of than hostile to that interest. The agricultural interest by the legislation of the last three years has been placed in an extraordinary favoured position. It was put upon an equal footing in 1894, but it has received since that time double the amount of the burden then put upon it. It has received £1,700,000 in relief of taxation which has not been extended to other classes of the community. You have given it relief in respect of rates. You say that such relief is due to everybody, but you have not given it to everybody. You have given it only to this class on whose behalf the right hon. Member for Thanet claims that you should put a heavy duty upon corn. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has spoken very reasonably upon the subject of the Amendment of the Death Duties. I said last year and I say again that if it could be shown that there is any unfair or unjust pressure upon any particular class, there would be no one less disposed than I to object to their Amendment. I did not allow last year any feeling of *amour propre* to interfere with any just Amendment of the law. But, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his advisers know very well, this is a most complicated system, and if you begin to pick the mortar out of the wall you do not know how soon the whole edifice may crumble to pieces. Anybody who deals with a great tax, whether it be the death duties or the income tax, must beware how he deals with the framework of the great fisal resources of the country, and, therefore, I feel sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be extremely careful—however plausible the grievance may appear to be—not to make any changes which will endanger a resource which is greatly required in consequence of the high expenditure of the country at the present time, and which cannot be safely tampered with. That is all I desire to say on the subject of the Death Duties. But I have a word to say upon the manner in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has dealt with the surplus which was at his disposal. When it was suggested on the introduction of the Budget that various taxes should be imposed, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he was not disposed to put on any new taxes on account of the disturbance they would make to industry and to trade. In that I entirely concur, but I see no occasion for putting on additional taxes. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a considerable sum at his disposal this year and last year, to deal with either in grants or in relief of taxation, and he has adopted a particular plan to which I desire to call attention. I want, for the purpose of what I am now saying, to leave untouched the one-and-a-half millions which he calls his surplus this year, out of which he has provided—and very wisely provided—the improvements in the Post Office; out of which he has taken £500,000 for additions to the Navy, with which we have yet to deal; £200,000 for troops in South Africa, in regard to which the discussion is postponed, and very properly postponed, until it can be properly taken; and

£500,000, which he reserves as margin. That I do not deal with; but I deal with the surpluses which he has disposed of. Now, he has disposed, in agricultural rating and in grants to Scotland and Ireland, of £1,660,000; he has given the Voluntary Schools £600,000; he has given up in land tax £100,000; and he has made alterations in the Death Duties to the extent of £200,000. Well, that added together makes about £2,600,000. That is the manner in which he has disposed of the two and a half-millions—in round numbers—which he had to deal with after providing for the vast expenditure which has been added to the public service in the last two years. Well now, this is a night, apparently, of alternative Budgets. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet has proposed a 5s. duty on corn. The hon. Member for Suffolk has made his proposal, that is an additional penny on the income tax. I claim my right, therefore, to put forward an alternative Budget—["hear, hear!"]—and a method of disposing of the £2,600,000 which I should prefer to that which has been adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There has been a great deal said about the tea duties. I am one of those who believe that the indirect taxation of this country ought to be further reduced. [*Opposition cheers.*] Sir, if there is anything we have learnt from that important document, the Report of the Irish Financial Commission, it is this—it has proved what anybody who has studied the subject must know to be the case—that indirect taxation presses unduly and disproportionately upon the poorer classes of the community. ["Hear, hear!"] In Ireland it presses unduly upon the whole country, because as a class they are very poor. But it is equally true in England—["hear, hear!"]—that it presses unduly upon the poorer classes of the English community. Therefore, if you want to carry out the great principle of taxation—that you should put the burden upon those who are best able to bear it and take it off those who are least able to bear it—you ought in the course of your taxation to follow the principle initiated by Sir Robert Peel and carried out by Mr. Gladstone, of diminishing the burden of indirect taxation in its proportion to direct taxation. [*Opposition cheers.*] Now the proportion is less grossly unjust than it was before household suffrage and when the privileged classes had the sole disposal of the taxation of the people—when they put the whole burden, or almost the whole burden, upon the masses of the people, in the shape of indirect taxation, and accepted hardly any part of that burden for themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] That was the condition of things before the year 1841. Well, we have gone on improving that until at last, as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech, 39 per cent. of the total taxation is raised now by direct taxation, but the larger proportion is raised by indirect taxation. I for one should never be satisfied until the proportions were at least made equal, which they now are not —[*Opposition cheers*]—and, therefore, I would seize any opportunity of diminishing indirect taxation—first of all, because it is the natural and proper method of meeting the Irish grievance—["hear, hear!"]—which unquestionably bear most unduly upon the indirect taxpayer; and you will also meet the grievances of the poorer classes of the English people by diminishing the proportion of the burden of indirect taxation. ["Hear, hear!"] I know it will shock my right hon. Friend the Member for Thanet, who wishes to increase indirect taxation. [*A laugh.*] That is just it. There, then, is the issue between us. Your policy ever since 1841—there is no need to go back to an antediluvian period—[*laughter*]—has been a policy of increasing indirect taxation in proportion to direct. Our policy is the opposite, that of diminishing indirect taxation, because it is unjust in its burden upon the poorer classes of the community. ["Hear, hear!"] Well, Sir, that being so, if I had had what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had—£2,600,000 to dispose of—I would have done what, when he had a surplus, the present First Lord of the Admiralty did, which was to take 2d. off the tea duty. [*Cheers.*] The First Lord of the Admiralty estimated a loss of £1,500,000 in the first year, but he only lost a million, and the Exchequer has not lost more since. I would dispose of £1,000,000 of his two-and-a-half millions and take 2d. off the tea duty, reducing it by one-half. Then I have

£1,600,000 left, and it is a very remarkable fact that that is exactly the sum which would enable you to take off a penny of the income-tax. [*Cheers.*] On the two occasions, now some years ago, when pennies were taken off the income-tax, you will find that the sum sacrificed in the first year was something under £1,600,000. There is a very simple Budget, but it has this advantage—that these remissions of taxation would have relieved all classes of the community. [*Cheers.*] It would not have affected merely the agricultural interest, though I understand that there is nothing which would have been more advantageous to the owners of land and to the country gentlemen than the relief of a penny in the income-tax. It would have gone to them in their lifetime, and it would not have been postponed until the melancholy event of their death. It would have benefited the commercial classes and the professional classes; it would have benefited, above all, those classes from whom the greatest increase of the income-tax comes—those wage-earning classes who by their thrift and industry emerge from the non-paying stratum by their improved condition in life into the income-tax paying class. Therefore, so far from agreeing with the Amendment of my right hon. Friend, who says that the time has arrived when recourse should be had to more varied sources of taxation, I should have been disposed to say that the time had arrived when the great surpluses at the disposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be applied to relieve the burden of existing taxes on the people. The views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject of the income-tax are rather surprising to me, and show that he moved among classes who are much more prosperous than I habitually meet. [*Laughter.*] In his Budget speech the right hon. Gentleman said:—

> "There are persons in the country to whom the Income Tax is odious, although I believe they are a decreasing number."

Where does he find this decreasing number?

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think Mr. Gladstone discovered that in 1874.

*SIR W. HARCOURT: But where is the decreasing number? So impressed is the Chancellor of the Exchequer with this view that I saw in a speech he delivered in the North he said that the iron interest was in such a prosperous condition that he expected them to come forward and propose the addition of another penny to the income-tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that he cannot reduce taxes now, but he looks forward to quieter times and a real reduction of expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman is a distinguished rural magnate; but if he expects a reduction of that expenditure he is like the gentleman in Horace, *Rusticus expectat*—[*laughter*]—and I doubt very much, although I hope he may live to the age of Methuselah and still be Chancellor of the Exchequer—[*laughter and cheers*]—at least so long as he belongs to the Party of which he is a leading member—whether he will see quieter times or a reduction of expenditure. The real time for reductions in taxation is when you have got a large surplus, and if you do not make a reduction in the income-tax, or tea duties when you have a large surplus, you never will. It is no use putting it off to times which may be worse and when you may not have the power of making those reductions which are now at your disposal. ["Hear, hear!"] I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will excuse me for having suggested a different disposal of the £2,500,000 from the one he has adopted. As he has made away with this money, I suppose the spilt milk is not now to be recovered. [*Laughter.*] But I hope if he has at a future time surpluses of this description and money to give away, he will not accept the advice of the hon. Member for Suffolk, in spite of the popularity of the income-tax, and although we are told that people are rushing in to pay their income-tax in consequence of the popularity of the present Administration. [*Laughter.*] I hope the popularity of the present Administration has some sounder basis than the enthusiasm for an 8d. income tax, and when the right hon. Gentleman has money at his disposal I hope he will not accept the advice of the hon. Member for Suffolk and add another penny to the income tax nor adopt the policy of the right hon. Member for Thanet and put a 5s. duty on corn. [*Cheers.*]

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) wished to support the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Thanet. Although he could not support it in detail he could support it generally, because, while he knew perfectly well that a duty of 5s. per quarter on wheat would bring their derelict land under cultivation, and, as the right hon. member for Montrose Burghs used to say, would make the valleys of Essex smile with golden grain, he could not help thinking that a 5s. duty was a counsel of perfection that the less they asked for the better. He desired to drive home a suggestion which was made by the hon. Member for Derry City. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, as they all knew, was a supporter of the temperance cause. The right hon. Gentleman taxed the brewers, but surely he must know that those manufacturers who turned out British wines were sailing uncommonly close to the wind and were very nearly overpassing the line. He thought when the House knew how far they had gone they would consider that they had already passed the line. Hon. Gentlemen perhaps were not aware that ordinary port and sherry were alcoholised only to the extent of 6 per cent., whereas British wines were alcoholised to the extent of from 9 to 15 per cent. in order to stop secondary fermentation. Two million gallons of this stuff were turned out every year, though who drank it he did not know. There was no conceivable reason why the excise should not either charge the makers for the alcohol they brewed or make them use alcohol on which a duty of 10s. per gallon was imposed. This would bring in £100,000 a year to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which might be allocated in relief of the agricultural interest, and as a sort of complement and supplement to the inefficient relief given that industry under the Agricultural Rating Bill of last year. His hon. Friend the Member for Woodbridge had called attention to the incidence of the Death Duties. Of course they fought the Death Duties in 1894 and got beaten, so that there was no more to be said about them. It was impossible to put the clock back, and they must make the best of the matter. The hon. Baronet, the Member for Wigtonshire, had told them a harrowing tale of an estate where the Death Duties were so crushing that the estate had to be let for the shooting rights. If the hon. Baronet would only come down to Essex he would find the landowners there uncommonly glad to let their property at 6d. per acre with the shooting rights thrown in. [*Laughter.*]

MR. JAMES LOWTHER asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

SIR H. FOWLER wished, before the Amendment was withdrawn, to call attention to a serious, if not dangerous, novelty which had been introduced, he hoped by accident, into the proceedings upon the Budget Bill. He believed the general, the almost invariable, practice had been to pass a Resolution that "it is expedient to amend the laws relating to Customs and Inland Revenue." This year that Resolution was not proposed. If that was done intentionally he thought it was due to the House that it should have been informed that such an innovation was being introduced and that the House would in consequence lose an opportunity for control over the whole taxation of the year. If the incident were allowed to pass unnoticed it would be one more step in curtailing the privileges of the House of Commons by this new mode of compressing and altering Resolutions on which Bills were founded. In his opinion the House should be especially jealous of its procedure in connection with the Finance Bill. On this occasion the House found itself confined to two Resolutions, one relating to the tea duty and the other to the income-tax, which would practically render the Committee stage of the Bill a farce. He hoped some assurance would be given that what had been done would not form a precedent for the future?

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said he would simply explain what happened. He supposed it had been almost invariably the case that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day, besides wishing to renew the income-tax and tea duty, had desired in some particular or other to amend the law relating to customs and inland revenue, and therefore a third Resolution had been carried in addition to the two relating to the tea duty and the income-tax. This year that was not done for the simple reason that he had no alteration to propose in the law relating to customs and inland revenue. He had not the smallest desire to limit the power of moving Amendments on the Budget Bill, and he would undertake, by setting up Committee of Ways and Means, which he hoped he might be allowed to do without debate, to move the ordinary Resolution relating to customs and inland revenue in order to afford any Member the opportunity of raising any question he might desire. He hoped he might appeal to the hon. Member for East Mayo not to raise his Amendment with regard to tobacco at the present stage, on the understanding that a proper opportunity would be afforded him in Committee.

MR. DILLON thought the offer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer an extremely fair one, and he was disposed to accept it. ["Hear, hear"].

SIR J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to take into consideration the case where two people, like husband and wife, or father and son, perished together. The Death Duty ought only to be charged once in such a case.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I believe that unless there is clear evidence of inheritance the Death Duty can only be charged once. I do not think there is a real grievance, but if the hon. Member will put down a Question, I will give him a more satisfactory answer.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill Read a Second time, and committed for Monday next.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Order for Third Reading Read.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be now Read the Third time."

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) asked for an explanation of the Measure.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said that there was a matter of doubt on the point by what process fines and penalties imposed on Volunteers for not making themselves efficient were recoverable. It was absolutely necessary that this doubt should be set at rest, and that the Bill would do.

MR. HUDSON KEARLEY (Devonport) said that the Bill was introduced to meet the adverse decisions of certain magistrates on cases against Volunteers.

*MR. BRODRICK said that the Bill did not alter the law, but simply put beyond doubt the law as it stood, according to the opinions of the best lawyers.

MR. KEARLEY said that the question had been tested in the Courts, and the opinions of the best lawyers had been found to be wrong. There would be great hardship to many young men who had been induced to join the Volunteers in a moment of enthusiasm, and who were prevented from putting in the necessary amount of drill, if they could be made, by civil process, to make good to the regiments the loss of capitation grant involved by their not being efficient. Everyone knew that many young men undertook responsibilities in joining the Volunteers of which they knew nothing. He thought the War Department might be content to allow the law to remain as it was, for it worked very well. The effect of the Bill would undoubtedly be to make Volunteering unpopular, and for that reason he objected to the Third Reading.

The House divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 44.—(Division List, No. 212.)

Bill Read the Third time, and passed.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

SCHOOL BOARDS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PATENT OFFICE EXTENSION (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Monday next.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

LEASEHOLDERS (PURCHASE OF FEE SIMPLE) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 1st June.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 3rd June.

COTTAGE HOMES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

MIDWIVES' REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

ELECTION PETITIONS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

CORN SALES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 3rd June.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Monday next.

MARKET GARDENERS' COMPENSATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be Read the Third time upon Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th Febraury] further adjourned till Thursday next.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till Monday next.

COLONIAL SOLICITORS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress to sit again upon Tuesday next.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

BURIAL GROUNDS.

Select Committee nominated of Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Robert Cameron, Viscount Cranborne, Mr. Bromley-Davenport, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Gretton, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Mr. Jebb, Sir George Osborne Morgan, Mr. Perks, Mr. Pym, Mr. H. C. Richards, Mr. J. W. Sidebotham, Mr. Carvell Williams, and Mr. Woodall.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS

Friday, 21st May 1897.

LUNACY BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Lunacy Acts—Was presented by the Lord Chancellor; Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 93.]

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

QUARTER SESSIONS JURORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments; passed, and returned to the Commons.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870, AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be Read 2ª on Tuesday next: (*The Lord President*).—[No. 95.]

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be Read 2ª on Monday next.—[No. 96.]

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

*LORD NORTON asked the Lord President of the Council whether he hoped to be able to introduce a Bill on Secondary Education this Session, or, if not, early next year? He pointed out that two small stopgap Measures had passed this Session on the subject of education, but, so far from satisfying the requirements of the subject, they called aloud for a better adjustment of secondary education in our national system. Advanced secondary education had not been so much added to as confused with primary education, and this confusion had damaged both primary and secondary education. Primary education was overlaid with many wholly irrelevant subjects; there was no clue to the subjects of instruction which properly belonged to it. The Elementary Code was simply a heap of confusion, and by the system of annual addition it was becoming worse confounded every year. Secondary education was equally damaged by this confusion; it was treated simply as a department of elementary instruction, or, if not, it was confused with a great variety of perfectly disconnected institutions which had the result of preventing systematic action and continuity of education. A million annually shovelled out of the Treasury into the laps of County Councils to be spent as they pleased, was an unworthy national provision for secondary education. So large a sum spent anyhow honestly for education must do some good somewhere, but as a whole this causes mischief, besides waste, as preventing better things. The idea of national education as a public undertaking to teach everybody everything is entirely new, and a wandering from former and better ideas. There is now a State ambition to undertake the whole nation's education. Only aristocratic sensitiveness shrinks from accepting it in common. It has already absorbed many small private and endowed schools, and its programme in pretension outbids Eton and Harrow. But our public provision for secondary education is properly meant for the artisan classes. As our primary provision is for a general training from infancy so our secondary should carry that general culture onwards, with special apprenticeship to various industries. Our public purse should not discharge rich manufacturers from parental responsibilities, though it may provide, by free scholarships, for clever children of the poor. In point of administration, also, he urged that, so far as the education question was to be undertaken by the State, there must be a central department instead of the half-dozen departments which were now overlapping each other in their action and competing with each other, thereby hindering anything like systematic continuity. Local authorities, too, are wanted of wider area than School Boards for secondary local requirements. He had the most perfect confidence, however, in the sound sense and judgment of the noble Duke, and in the Vice President, who, he thought, showed in his attempt at legislation last year a sense of how large the scope of the subject was; and his plans, if they had been fairly treated by the House of Commons, though they were on a scale for which the country was hardly prepared, had the materials in them to meet the requirements of the country.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): I cannot agree with my noble Friend in the opinion that the large sum which was devoted a few years ago to the purposes of technical instruction, and which is being expended through the agency of the County Councils and the Borough Councils, is in any degree being wasted. On the contrary, I believe that, on the whole, the money is being very usefully applied. However, I may say that we are perfectly aware of the importance and urgency of the question to which my noble Friend has called the attention of the House, and we propose to ask Parliament to legislate upon it at the earliest possible opportunity. He has referred to the Measure which was introduced last year, and which was of much wider scope than that which was brought in this year, and I think he has referred in terms of some approval to the proposals contained in the Measure of last year, so far as they related to secondary education. Considering the time that has been devoted by Parliament already to educational questions this year, I do not entertain any hope that we shall be able to ask Parliament to deal seriously with the subject in the course of the present Session. However, I think it will probably be desirable that proposals which the Government are prepared to make on the subject of secondary education should be as long as possible before the country, and that they should receive full consideration and be discussed by those who are interested in the question. I hope, therefore, in the course of the present Session, either in this or the other House, that we shall be able to lay before Parliament in the shape of a Bill, the main proposals which were contained in the Bill of last year so far as they related to secondary education, with some amendments and additions, in order that the general views of the Government may be once more placed before the country, and that the country may be in a position to consider them during the vacation. ["Hear, hear!"]

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order).

Clause 10,—

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES.

Any offence under this Act may be prosecuted before a court of summary jurisdiction in manner provided by the Summary Jurisdiction Acts.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved, after the word "prosecuted," to insert the words "and any forfeiture recoverable."

Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH moved the following new clause to follow Clause 4:—

"Any person retaining or receiving an infant under the age of two years on consideration of a sum of money not exceeding £20 paid down, and without any agreement for further payment, as value for the care and bringing up of the said infant until it is reclaimed or of an age to provide for itself, shall within 48 hours from the time of receiving such infant give notice of the fact to the local authority. If he does not give the notice required by this section, he shall be liable to forfeit the amount of any sum received by him in respect of such infant, or such less sum as the Court having cognisance of the case shall deem just, and the Court shall give directions as to the manner in which the sum forfeited shall be applied for the benefit of the infant, and shall, if necessary, cause the infant to be removed to a workhouse or place of safety, and the master of such workhouse shall receive such infant, which shall be maintained in the workhouse or place of safety until it can be otherwise lawfully disposed of."

His Lordship explained that the clause attempted to deal with people who put out infants to nurse and paid down a lump sum for them. The clause was much desired by those interested in the question, on the ground that it might act as a deterrent in such cases. The cases the Bill really sought to deal with were those in which children were put out to nurse, and a comparatively small sum was paid down which could not possibly pay for their education and proper up-bringing. Those were cases where it might reasonably be concluded that the children were put out to nurse with the idea that they would never be heard of again. The limitation of £20 would, he believed, include the greater number of cases of baby-farming which were at the root of so many of the evils connected with the trade, and would exclude the greater number of genuine cases in which well-to-do people who, being obliged to leave the country, pay down a certain sum for the care and up-bringing of the children whom they required to leave behind.

Clause read First and Second time, and ordered to stand part of the Bill; Bill to be Read 3ª on Monday next; and to be printed as amended.—[No. 94.]

House Adjourned at Five o'clock, to Monday next, a Quarter before Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21st May 1897.

NEW WRIT.

For the County of Hants (Eastern or Petersfield Division), *v.* William Wickham, esquire, deceased.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION TO WOMEN) BILL.

Committee deferred from Wednesday, 23rd June till Wednesday, 7th July.

QUESTIONS.

VICTORIA CROSS (TROOPER BAXTER).

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Secretary of State for War would reconsider his decision, as announced in a memorandum which appeared in *The London Gazette* of 7th May, with respect to Trooper Frank William Baxter, of the Buluwayo Field Force, in which it is stated that on account of the gallant conduct of this man in having, on 22nd April 1896, dismounted and given up his horse to a wounded comrade, Corporal Wiseman, who was being closely pursued by an overwhelming force of the enemy, he would have been recommended to Her Majesty for the Victoria Cross had he survived; and, in consideration of the self-sacrificing act of devotion to his wounded comrade which cost Trooper Baxter his life, would he recommend to Her Majesty that the Victoria Cross should be conferred on the late trooper on the date of his gallant action, and that the decoration so heroically earned should be forwarded to his nearest relative?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I can assure my hon. and gallant Friend of the full sympathy of the Secretary of State in his wish to commemorate the noble deed of Trooper Baxter; but the statutes of the Victoria Cross do not contain any provision under which a man who is already dead can be recommended for the distinction. Many cases have occurred in which the Cross would have been awarded had the soldier or sailor survived, but no exception to the rule I have stated has ever been made.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DUBLIN).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick (Mr. W. FIELD), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether the report of the inquiry to which the public were not admitted, recently held in Dublin by a Departmental Committee appointed by the Government, to report what accommodation is required for a Royal College of Science for Ireland and where it should be built, and whether new buildings were required, will be laid upon the Table of the House; and (2) whether it is the intention that the College shall continue under the control of the Science and Art Department in London or whether it will be incorporated in the scheme of technical education for Ireland and to be under Irish management?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): So far as I am aware, the Committee has not yet made its Report, and until it has been received and considered, I am not prepared to say whether it will be laid on the Table of the House. I cannot at present, make any statement in reference to the inquiries in the second paragraph of the Question.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether it the intention of the Government to introduce this Session a Bill dealing with technical education in Ireland; and (2) whether it is the intention that the Science and Art Department thereof shall continue under the control of South Kensington or whether it will be included under Irish management.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have already answered the second paragraph of the Question. With regard to the first paragraph, I must ask the hon. Member to wait for the statement of my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury.

LOCAL LOAN FUND.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state where and when and by whom the Local Loans Funds Accounts are audited; and whether a great portion of this money, £40,000,000, was issued at three per cent premium; and, whether he can state how that item was dealt with.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The accounts of the Local Loans Fund are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General under section 16 of the Act 50 and 51 Vic. cap. 16, and are presented to Parliament. The total amount of Local Loans Stock created has been £40,953,767. 14s. 5d., of which there was issued at par (1887) £36,526,056. 17s. 5d., the balance of £4,427,710. 17s.0d. having been issued (in 1888 and 1889) at an average premium of £3. 10s. 9d. per cent. The premium is specially shown in the annual balance sheet (see House of Commons Paper 117 of 1897). It was (when received) employed in making advances for loans, reducing thereby the amount of stock required to be created and consequently the charge for interest.

AGRICULTURAL RATING ACT (IRELAND).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon Member for Dublin, St. Patrick, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state where is the £74,000 accruing to Ireland under the Agricultural Rating Act, and if it is bearing any interest, or for what purpose it will be used?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A sum of £74,870 has been paid to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account under the Estate Duty Act of last year in respect of the period ended March 31, 1897. The question whether this money bears interest is one that should be addressed to my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury. With regard to the disposal of the money, I can at present only refer the hon. Member to the provisions of Clause 6 of the Poor Relief Bill recently introduced.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: asked whether the Secretary to the Treasury was prepared to answer that part of his question which the right hon. Gentleman was unable to answer

[No answer was given.]

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.): asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say where this Local Loan Fund was kept, whether in Ireland or in connexion with the Treasury?

[No answer was given.]

KERRY ESTATES (RECEIVERS).

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant a Return showing the estates in the county of Kerry over which receivers are appointed, giving respectively the owner of the estate, name, and residence of receiver appointed?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: This Question is practically a repetition of the Question put to me by the hon. Member on the 22nd March last. I am afraid I have nothing to add to the reply given by me on that occasion.

FUGITIVE SLAVES (ZANZIBAR COAST).

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is intended that the present arrangements as to slavery, and as to fugitive slaves, should continue on the Zanzibar Coast under the control of Her Majesty's Government after the abolition of slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): Under the existing arrangements on the mainland coast of the Protectorate any slaves can gain their freedom by crossing the ten-mile border into the interior. For this and for other reasons, which the limits of an answer do not provide an adequate opportunity for stating, it is not proposed to alter the arrangements on the coast.

MARYBOROUGH GAOL (PRISONER THOMAS COLLINS.)

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with respect to the statement of evidence enclosed with the petition in favour of the release of Thomas Collins, a prisoner confined in Maryborough Prison, whether he is aware that Thomas Collins was convicted solely on an approver's evidence, and that Mr. Justice Holmes at the trial characterised the approver as a vile character; and, whether inquiries have been made to the mental and physical condition of Thomas Collins?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The prisoner named in the Question, together with four others, was tried at the Munster Winter Assizes of 1891 on the charge of conspiracy to murder. He was convicted and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude. It is not the fact that Collins was convicted solely on the evidence of an approver; on the contrary there was a considerable volume of independent evidence corroborating the details of the approver's testimony. I am not aware that the learned Judge spoke of him as a vile character, though it is no doubt possible that he did. The convict was recently examined by the Medical Member of the Prisons Board, who reports that mentally he may be described as simple and that physically his health is good.

MR. FLAVIN: Surely the right hon. Gentleman must be aware if he looks at the evidence——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

DOG LICENCE (GOVAN).

MR. JOHN WILSON (Lanark, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the occupier of Broomloan Farm, Govan, who keeps on an average 29 cattle, has been fined for keeping a dog without a licence, although application had been made and refused for a statutory form claiming exemption; and, whether it is within the province of the Inland Revenue officer of the district to refuse to supply to an applicant the necessary form for making a declaration claiming exemption?

MR. HANBURY: The form of declaration to which the hon. Member refers is prescribed to be used by the owner of a dog "kept and used solely for the purpose of tending sheep or cattle on a farm, or in the exercise of the calling or occupation of a shepherd." The Inland Revenue officer, in refusing to receive a declaration from the applicant in this case, was acting under the instructions of the Board of Inland Revenue, who, after carefully investigating the case, satisfied themselves that the applicant was not a farmer or a shepherd, and that the dog, which was kept on his premises at 177, Broomloan Road, Govan, could in no sense be said to be kept and used solely for the purpose of tending sheep or cattle on a farm.

KERRY GRAND JURY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that members of the Kerry Grand Jury are contractors to that body; also that men occupying the position of agents to those contractors are also members of the Kerry Grand Jury; and, if so, whether this is legal?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Secretary of the Grand Jury, with whom I have communicated, is not aware that any member of the Grand Jury is contractor to that body; nor is he aware that agents of contractors to the Grand Jury are members of the Grand Jury.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that several members of the Kerry Grand Jury are agents of the contractors and that the secretary himself is agent to his own brother?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The reply I have given is that which I have been furnished with after inquiry. If the hon. Gentleman will bring evidence before me as to the facts he states, I will make further inquiries.

Mr. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to give the names of the contractors? [*Cries of* "Order."]

[No answer was given.]

EDUCATION OFFICE (DUBLIN).

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of the fact that Civil servants employed in the Education Board, Dublin, as abstractors have to perform precisely the same duties as second division clerks but without prospects of advancement, which compels them to stand almost on the same footing as boy copyists, also that many of these officials have served long periods in their several positions; whether, in case the Treasury cannot immediately accede to the request contained in their recent petitions, he can hold out any hope of improved prospects for this class of public officials in the near future?

Mr. HANBURY: I am not aware of any case in the Civil Service in which abstractors are performing precisely the same duties as second division clerks. The abstractor class was expressly created for the performance of work of a higher order than copying, but not of sufficiently advanced or responsible character to be assigned to second division clerks, and it is for such work only that the Treasury has sanctioned the employment of abstractors in various departments. If in any department the line of demarcation drawn by the Treasury had been subsequently abandoned and the work of the two classes amalgamated, as the hon. Member asserts, it is clear that the abstractors would be doing too high work and the second division too low, and the abstractors should bring the matter before the responsible head of the department as a question of internal administration. There is of course no comparison between temporary boy copyists, who cannot rise beyond 18s. a week, or be retained after reaching the age of 20, and abstractors who are permanent and pensionable officers and can rise to £150 a year. The abstractor class has only been in existence six years, so none of its members can have served long periods in that capacity. As regards their demand for improved prospects, I have nothing to add to the answers I have repeatedly given to similar proposals.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a series of resolutions from the North Dublin Union on the subject of his proposed Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill: and, can he state whether in Committee any of these resolutions would be given effect to by his assent to the changes they propose in the Bill?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The resolutions referred to have been received. I am unable at present to make any statement regarding the Poor Relief Bill.

ITALIAN ICE-CREAM VENDORS.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the action of Mr. Alderman Knight in fining an Italian 10s. for selling ice-cream in the street, whilst a Scotchman who was selling fruit in the same vicinity was only fined 1s., the Alderman remarking that the Italian should be mulcted because all Italians were a nuisance; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into all the circumstances of the case?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): The Secretary of State has made inquiry and finds that the circumstances of the two cases, which are not quite correctly stated in the Question, were so different as in the opinion of the Alderman to justify the difference in treatment. The Secretary of State has no reason to think that the Alderman was wrong in the view he took. The Alderman denies that he used the expression which is attributed to him in the Question.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

MR. JOHN AIRD (Paddington. N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if orders will be given to clean the public statues in the line of the proposed route on Jubilee Day?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir.

MR. AIRD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what extra allowance or consideration will be given to the Metropolitan Police for their arduous duties on Jubilee Day?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: It was hardly necessary for my hon. Friend to remind the Secretary of State of what he is of course always anxious to do, namely, to acknowledge in a proper way, as has previously been done, the services of the Metropolitan Police on special occasions. It is premature, however, to make any statement on the subject now before those services have been rendered.

MR. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS, (Notts, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the difficulty occupants of seats on the occasion of the Royal Jubilee procession will have in reaching them before nine in the morning, carriages may be allowed to proceed to places on the route between Westminster Bridge and Buckingham Palace up to Ten o'clock as fixed for the route on the south of the river?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: The Commissioner is not yet in a position to say what regulations will be necessary, but the point raised by the hon. Member will not be lost sight of when they come to be made.

MR. J. CUMMING MACDONA, (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will make arrangements so that the Royal Irish Constabulary take part in the proceedings at the coming Jubilee?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Arrangements have already been made for the participation of a mounted detachment of the Royal Irish Constabulary in the Jubilee procession on June 22nd. [*Cheers.*]

MR. J. H. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he is aware that on 23rd June, the day on which Her Majesty is to review some 10,000 school children on Constitution Hill, and a day for which in Nottingham and other great provincial towns Diamond Jubilee celebrations involving the presence of school children are appointed, the Science and Art Department are to hold examinations, as at present arranged, and whether, to avoid the obvious inconvenience, absence from examination, and consequent loss, he will postpone the examinations due on 23rd June until some more convenient date?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Science and Art Department have received no applications for the postponement of these examinations. No change could now be made without great inconvenience to the majority of schools.

RATHKEALE UNION (ELECTION OF GUARDIAN).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the grounds upon which the Local Government Board refused to institute an Inquiry into a recent election of a Poor Law Guardian for the Mohernagh Division of the Rathkeale Union, in which the defeated candidate, Mr. William Harte, claimed a sworn Inquiry on the alleged grounds that 16 votes recorded against him were all in the same handwriting, the disallowance by the returning officer of six proxy votes, and other irregularities; and whether he will advise the Local Government Board to hold the Inquiry asked for by Mr. Harte?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Local Government Board carefully considered the objections raised by the defeated candidate as well as the reasons for the decision arrived at by the returning officer, and came to the conclusion that there was no ground for ordering an Inquiry in this case. Objections to the return of persons as guardians are very numerous, and frequently consist of mere allegations, unsupported by evidence. No evidence was forwarded in the present case in support of the allegation made by the defeated candidate, nor was sufficient cause otherwise shown for holding an Inquiry. I see no reason, under the circumstances, for requesting the Board to reconsider their decision.

MULLINGAR UNION.

Mr. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board are aware that the medicine contract in Mullingar Union was cancelled last year as the result of a sworn Inquiry into grave irregularities which were found to exist, the accounts of the contractor not having been properly checked by the clerk of the Union, whose brother was in the employment of the contractor; and that the medicine contract has been voted this year by the friends of the clerk of the Union to the same contractor, whose tender was found to be the highest; and whether he can state what action the Local Government Board have taken in the matter?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The circumstances under which the medicine contract was terminated last year were referred to in my answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of the 26th January. I have no information regarding the occupation of the clerk's brother. The Guardians have this year given the contract to the same contractor; the tender was not shown to be the highest, and upon a comparison of the prices of the drugs most in use it would appear that three tenders were higher and five lower than the accepted tender. The Guardians are not bound to accept the lowest or any tender, and under the existing law the Local Government Board do not see their way to intervene in this matter. By Clause 39 of the Poor Relief Bill, now before the House, the Board will be empowered, however, to make regulations in respect of medicine contracts which, while continuing to the Guardians the power of selecting the contractor, will enable them to determine at a glance which tender is most favourable to the Union, a matter which they have great difficulty in deciding under the present system.

LARCENY (ALLEGED), CO. TYRONE.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that two brothers named Maguire, County Tyrone, are at present in prison for larceny, although substantial bail has been offered to the Crown on behalf of the Maguires to stand any further trial; and whether he can say if there are in Ireland any other prisoners besides the Maguires in prison, charged with larceny, who offered bail for their appearance?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. J. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): I am aware that the brothers Maguire are at present in custody charged with larceny. I am further aware that an application made to the Judge presiding at the late trial of the accused to admit them to bail was refused by him. The prisoners have not since, so far as I know, made any applications to the Queen's Bench Division to be admitted to bail as they were entitled to do. I cannot answer the latter portion of the Question; besides there are circumstances in this case which distinguish it from any other of which I have any knowledge.

PARCEL POST.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received complaints of the difficulty farmers and others encounter in sending parcels of merchandise 1 lb. in weight for the minimum price of 3d. because of the additional weight of the wrappers of paper, etc.; and whether if he cannot see his way to reduce the cost of carriage of parcels to a minimum of 1d. per lb., he will permit 1 lb. to go through the post for 2d. or 2 lb. for 3d.; if not, will he permit 1½ lbs. to go for 3d. so as to allow for packing?

Mr. HANBURY: Applications have been received from various quarters that the parcel post rates should cover slightly more than the even pound or pounds in order to allow for the weight of wrappers. The changes in the scale of rates which have been announced will to some extent meet the wishes of the hon. Member by reducing the charge on a parcel between 1 lb. and 2 lb. from 4½d. to 4d., but it is not possible to make any further concession. The weight of the packing would, of course, vary greatly according to the nature of the articles sent, and it would be impracticable to fix a margin which would be fair to all alike.

TELEGRAPH CHARGES.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, as he has consented by special official notification to charge "sha'n't" as one word and "mother-in-law" as one word, he will so far relax the rule as to permit "Charing Cross" to go as one word in telegraphing; and whether he is aware that "Kentish Town," a postal and telegraph office, is charged two words in a telegram, but "Woodford Green" is charged as one word?

Mr. HANBURY: The anomalies which the hon. Member so frequently points out are the result of concessions. One of the words he has quoted as anomalous—"mother-in-law"—was, I believe, first dealt with as one word at the urgent request of my hon. Friend himself. [*Laughter.*] I think that the rule which refers to the names of places is a reasonable one. It is that the names of all separate towns and villages are treated as one word. Of course, neither Kentish Town nor Charing Cross is the name of a town or village. If that rule were departed from, it is difficult to say what might not be treated as a local name and claim the privilege.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON: May I ask why is "stepfather" charged as two words and "grandmother" one? [*Laughter.*]

PROBATION OF FIRST OFFENDERS ACT.

Mr. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the statement made by the Chairman of the London Sessions in charging the Grand Jury on Tuesday last, that out of a total of 204 convicted persons released ment, from 1894 down to last year, 12 only had since offended; and whether he will by circular or otherwise call the will by circular or otherwise call the attention of Justices throughout the country to the successful working of the Probation of First Offenders Act, with a view to its more frequent application?

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: The Secretary of State has seen the very satisfactory statement by the Chairman of the London Sessions to which the hon. Member alludes. There is nothing however, in the evidence before him as to the working of the Probation of First Offenders Act and similar enactments which would lead him to suppose that Courts of Summary Jurisdiction are unmindful of the powers which they possess under those Acts, or that any new circular from the Home Office is needed in regard to the manner in which they use them.

BANKRUPTCY COURT (IRELAND).

Major JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy in the judicial staff of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland, occasioned by the death of the late Judge Miller; and, if not, what provision exists for the discharge of the business of the Court in the event of the unavoidable absence owing to illness or otherwise of the existing Judge?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The whole matter is under the consideration of the Government, and some definite decision will, I hope, soon be arrived at. The contingency mentioned in the last sentence has not arisen.

BRUSSELS ACT.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devon, Honiton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that all the signatories to the Brussels Act are under obligation to give a certificate of freedom to all slaves entering their territories which come under that Agreement, instructions in accordance therewith have been given to Her Majesty's

Agents in the British East African Protectorate?

Mr. CURZON: My hon. Friend is, I think, not quite correct in his interpretation of the Brussels Act. There is nothing in that Act compelling its signatories to give letters of freedom to all slaves entering their territories. The letters are to be given to all slaves liberated under the conditions laid down by the Act. Instructions to look to this Act for guidance have been given to Her Majesty's Agents in East Africa.

Sir C. DILKE: Does the latter part of that reply extend to the fugitive slaves' provisions?

Mr. CURZON: Oh, yes, Sir; they cover everything touched by the Brussels Act.

DEATH OF PAUPER (CITY OF LONDON).

Mr. D. CRILLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can now inform the House as to the result of his inquiries respecting the death of the old woman, Margaret Ross, upon whose body an inquest was held in the Hackney Coroner's Court on 3rd May, when it appeared in evidence that the deceased had been an inmate of a City union workhouse, that her age was 77 years, and that she had been found dead on the previous Thursday beside the washing pail which she had been using in her work, and that the workhouse authorities had been in the habit of compelling this old woman to clean out a large ward containing twelve beds?

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Henry Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I have been in communication with the Guardians of the City of London on the subject, and I have also obtained copies of the depositions taken at the inquest in the case. It appeared from the medical evidence and a post-mortem examination that the death of the poor woman was instantaneous—from natural causes, and due neither to syncope nor weakness. It is not the case that the workhouse authorities compelled her to clean out a ward. She had, up to some nine days before her death, been employed in the needle-room, and it was at her own special request that she was allowed to undertake the duty of keeping a dormitory clean, as she preferred this to the more sedentary work, and said she was quite capable of undertaking it.

TOKAT MASSACRE.

Mr. J. C. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Sir Philip Currie has addressed a letter to Tewfik Pasha in reference to the recent massacre of Armenians at Tokat; whether he can state to the House the nature of this communication; and what action the representatives of the Great Powers propose to take in regard to the miscarriage of justice which has taken place?

Mr. CURZON: Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has not yet reported to us upon the result of the investigation that has been conducted by the Turkish Commission at Tokat; nor do we know whether he has addresed a Note on the subject to the Porte. I have no doubt that we shall very shortly hear from him on the subject.

Mr. FLYNN: When shall I put a further Question?

Mr. CURZON: If the hon. Gentleman likes to put a Question down on Monday, I will try to answer it. I will let him know as soon as we hear.

SCIENCE AND ART CLASSES (IRELAND).

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the new rules of the South Kensington Science and Art Department prohibit the pupils of national schools in Ireland being enrolled in the science classes; whether the teachers who are thus deprived of the result fees for science subjects are allowed an equivalent; upon what grounds and by whom were the Irish national school pupils deprived of the advantages of these science classes; and whether he will consider the advisability of re-establishing the rule which allowed the pupils of sixth and higher classes of Irish national schools to be enrolled in science classes?

Sir J. GORST: The new rule, which applies to Great Britain as well as Ireland, is intended to prevent the scholars in elementary schools from earning a double grant for a single attendance—one from the Education and the other from the Science and Art authorities. No compensation is to be paid to teachers because such an abuse of the grants is prevented. The Irish elementary pupils have as ample opportunities of learning science as those in other parts of the United Kingdom, as day scholars in the elementary schools, and as evening scholars under the Science and Art Department. No change in the rule is contemplated.

PETTY SESSIONS (MAGISTERIAL JURISDICTION).

Mr. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state upon what principle certain magistrates may adjudicate in all petty sessions districts in the county named in their commissions, while other magistrates in the same county are confined to certain districts only; how many magistrates in Fermanagh enjoy the privilege of sitting at all petty sessions in that county, and how many are confined to limited areas; and will any steps be taken to limit the jurisdiction in the one case, or to extend it in the other, so that the existing distinction may cease?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Question is based upon a supposition which is erroneous. I have already explained to the hon. Member that all magistrates are expected to confine their attendance at petty sessions to the districts specified on their appointment to the Commission. The Lord Chancellor does not sanction the atendance of a magistrate at all petty sessions throughout the county.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH (COURT OF JUSTICE).

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Attorney General if his attention has been called to the ordinary form of English oath as administered in courts of justice; and whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to alter the ordinary form of English oath, and to abolish the objectionable practice known as kissing the book in the administration of oaths of all descriptions?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight): My attention has been called to the question of the desirability of changing the form of oath, but I think that the fear of infection has been somewhat exaggerated. I would remind the hon. Member that under the provisions of the Oaths Act 1888, witnesses are now permitted to take oath in Scotch form under which it is unnecessary to kiss the book. I will, however, consider whether any further amendment of the law is required.

JUDICIARY (IRELAND).

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in reference to the vacancy on the Irish Judicial Bench, caused by the death of the late Justice Barry, whether the Government will adhere to the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the subject of the excessive cost of the legal and judicial establishments in Ireland, and the return to Ireland of the amount by which such excessive cost is reduced?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The Government in no way recede from the declaration made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on this subject; but I am not in a position at this moment to make any statement with regard to the vacancy caused by the death of Lord Justice Barry.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is it not the fact that the Irish Judicial Bench is still considerably overmanned?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: That is a general question on which many successive Governments have made declarations, and I am not sure that anything will be gained by giving a special answer.

BENEFICES BILL.

Viscount CRANBORNE (Rochester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it has been brought to his notice that the Benefices Bill stands the first Order for Wednesday 26th instant; and whether he can give an assurance that that day will not be taken for Government business?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: In answer to my noble Friend I have to say that it does seem certain that Wednesday the 26th instant, will be taken for Government business, the Committee stage of the Compensation to Workmen Bill. I, of course, greatly regret that my noble Friend should be deprived of that Wednesday for his Benefices Bill, especially when it happens that the Measure has my warm personal sympathy, as my noble Friend is aware. But, whatever is to be gained by the discussion of the Bill, there is little or no probability—I will put it more strongly, and say that there is no possibility—of a private Bill being passed into law at this time of the Session.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: May I ask whether, in view of the great importance attributed to many of the provisions of this Bill, my right hon. Friend can hold out any expectation that, in lieu of this particular Wednesday, we may have some other opportunity of discussing the Bill in the course of the Session, or, failing that, whether the Government will consider the propriety of dealing with this subject themselves in the next Session of Parliament?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: My noble Friend is a sufficiently experienced Member of the House to know that the Government can express no preference for or give advantage to any private Member's Bill. With regard to the second part of his Question, I am not in a position to give a complete answer to it at the present time, but I can assure him of the sympathy of myself and many of my colleagues on this question. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE ARMISTICE.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given him private notice. It is whether he can state what are the terms of the armistice concluded between the Greek and Turkish forces in Thessaly, and to what period of time it extends?

MR. CURZON: In reply to the hon. Member, I regret to say that we have no official information as to the exact terms or duration of the armistice that has been concluded either in Thessaly or Epirus; but we have telegraphed to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople for the details.

First Lord of the Treasury.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND).

MINISTERIAL PROPOSALS.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I have deferred from day to day during the last fortnight the making of a statement in answer to certain Questions which have been addressed to me from the other side of the House. Some of those Questions relate to the Irish Agricultural Industries Bill and other Bills now on the Paper in the name of the Government having reference to Irish administration. Others are Questions relating to the policy of the Government in connection with a grant to Ireland, based on similar lines to those adopted in the Act of last year, which gave relief to the rates on agricultural land in England. These two questions may seem at first to be little connected with each other, but in the view of the Government they are really inextricably intertwined. There are two aspects of the same policy which cannot by any possibility be separately considered. The House is aware that the Government have declared that in their view Ireland possessed no claim in strict equity to the many hundreds of thousands of pounds which would be required if the rating question were to be treated on lines similar to those adopted in England. [*Irish laughter.*] I am stating a question of fact. The House is aware that that was, and I may add that it still is, the attitude taken up by the Government. I am conscious that I am not in agreement with hon. Gentlemen opposite. I am aware that their opinions on the subject are shared by other Irish representatives in this House and by the great mass of public opinion in Ireland. [*Irish cheers.*] I am not disputing the fact, and I am not arguing the question. I am merely stating that upon the question of abstract equity the Government have not changed their minds nor do they see any reason to depart from the attitude recently taken up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the First Lord of the Admiralty. Even if we took a different view upon this question, I think hon. Members on all sides of the House would see that there would be the very greatest difficulty in giving any large subvention in relief of local rates in Ireland until the question of local government was settled. Hon. Members opposite have asked for a great deal of new wine, but they propose that it should be put into very old bottles. [*Laughter.*] That is a policy which presents very great difficulties, and we are of opinion that it would not be in the power of this or any other Government to consider the question of large subventions to Irish rates apart from the question of a large modification of Irish local government. We are brought to the same result if we consider the kind of criticism levelled from more than one quarter of the House against many of the attempts at administrative reform in Ireland which have from time to time been attempted. The object of those reforms is often accepted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but they criticise the details of the Bills in which they are embodied, and object to their passage because they say, with a certain amount of force, that the machinery now in existence is of so antiquated a character—["hear, hear!"]—that it is not possible or right to throw upon it the new duties that would necessarily be thrown upon it by the Measures in question. When I say the machinery is antiquated I am expressing no new opinion. We have, indeed, never denied that, so far as county administration is concerned, the work done by grand juries has been honest work, able and economical work. ["Hear, hear!" *and* "No!"] But, at the same time, we have invariably admitted that both the machinery for administering county government and poor relief in Ireland belong to a class of political machinery which we have rejected in England and Scotland, and which the great majority on this side of the House are pledged to reform in Ireland also. [*Irish laughter* and an HON. MEMBER: "1886!"] I hear an hon. Member say "1886!" I do not know what 1886 has to do with local government in Ireland, but I have in my mind a Bill introduced in 1892 which did not proceed very far —[*laughter*]—which, indeed, apart from the special political difficulty of that year, might not under any circumstances have received the general assent of the House, but which was an honest attempt on my part to deal with the special difficulties of Irish administration as they then presented themselves to me. What was the objection taken to the Bill? It was this —that while it had no doubt put Irish local government upon a broad popular basis as far as the franchise was concerned, it was hedged round and, as it were, crowded with elaborate precautions which were not required, in our opinion, in England or Scotland, and which had not been introduced in the English or Scotch Bills, but which we did think were necessary if we were to give local government to Ireland under the circumstances then existing. Consider, then, the apparent dilemma into which we are forced by this line of argument. We cannot, it would seem, give anything to Irish rates without reforming Irish local government. We cannot, owing to the special circumstances of Ireland, reform its local government without encumbering the new system with elaborate and irritating precautions. At first sight, the difficulty seems insoluble. But, on more mature reflection, it would seem that we have now presented to us an opportunity, perhaps an absolutely unique opportunity, of meeting the difficulties we have always felt in the extension of local government to Ireland, and at the same time meeting the claims which have been put forward with so much energy and eloquence by all classes of Irish opinion in the last few weeks. We believe that a plan can be devised by which both these great objects can be attained and which will secure the friendly support of every class. I do not on the present occasion intend to go into details. I am only speaking by the leave of the House. Obviously the Bill embodying such a plan cannot be introduced until next Session, but, broadly, our scheme is this. We should propose to place both the Poor Law and county administration upon a broad and popular basis—[*cheers*]—but, as I have explained, that can only be done if at the same time the owners of agricultural land can be relieved of the apprehension which, rightly or wrongly, they entertain with regard to the possible extravagance, perhaps unintentional, and perhaps intentional, of the new public bodies which are to be called into existence. We hold further that to attain this object the landlords must be relieved from all rural rates in the future.

I make no secret at all about it. That is a wide departure from the course which we have pursued in England or Scotland. [*Irish cheers.*] We think it a necessary departure. Roughly speaking, the landlords' liability for agricultural land at this moment consists of paying half the poor rates. We propose to pay that half out of the Imperial Exchequer for the future. ["Hear, hear!"] We propose also to pay half the county cess. The landlord would gain by the first and the tenant by the second of these subventions, while there is this double benefit for the two classes, it will be observed that we gain our great object, that, namely, of launching local government under circumstances which would make it palatable and safe for all classes. It may, perhaps, be objected that this gift is illusory. The tenants, on the one hand, may say, "If you give half the county cess, that is all very well as long as our judicial rents are running, but what is to happen at the end of the 15 years? Will the whole of this not be put by the action of the Sub-Commissioners into the pockets of the landlord? Will, therefore, the relief nominally intended for us not, as a matter of fact, go to the landlords?" The landlords on the other hand, may say, "What we have been afraid of in giving county government in Ireland is the extravagance, intentional or unintentional, of the popular bodies to be created. How are we protected from the extravagance if at the end of the 15 years any increase of the rates which may have occurred by the action of those bodies in the interval is to be thrown on us by the action of the Sub-Commissioners?" It will be seen, therefore, that each party contemplates, and possibly contemplates rightly, that the gift which under the plan I am now proposing would be given by the Imperial Exchequer might by the natural and legitimate action of the Land Courts be taken from them and given to the other class concerned in the cultivation of the land. And again, the tenants might say, "Though the landlords anticipate that this establishment of popular local government in Ireland will lead to extravagance, we, the tenants, take precisely the opposite view. We think that the existing system has produced an unnecessary expenditure of local funds in Ireland, and that the result of the change will not be to increase rates, but to diminish them." [Mr. T. M. HEALY: "Hear, hear!"] Of course, I do not prophesy which result will occur, but while I think the landlords should be protected from the possible extravagance of the new bodies, I think they should not be allowed to reap the benefits of the possible economy of the new bodies, and therefore I think we ought to introduce into any Bill for local government in Ireland provisions by which we should secure, first, that the tenant should reap the whole benefit of that part of the county cess which is to be given to him by the Exchequer, and, secondly, that he should reap the whole benefit of any economy he may introduce in the administration, or of any public improvements, roads, and the like, which may be made out of the county cess, after the new county government has been established. On the other hand, I think that equal precautions should be taken to prevent the landlords suffering from the extravagance which some prophets anticipate from either the inexperience or the design of the new County Councils and the new Poor Law Guardians. I do not know whether I have made these broad elements of our policy clear.

MR. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): There is one point I should like to mention. What is proposed to be done in the cases where the landlord now pays all the poor rate?

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: That is the well-known case of where the rent is £4 and under. I rather avoided that as being a detail, but it is a detail of such importance that the hon. Gentleman is no doubt justified in asking me across the floor of the House a question relating to it. The present idea of the Government is in that case, as in the other, that half the poor rate should be paid by the State, and that the other half of the existing poor rate should be automatically subtracted from the rent now paid by the tenant to the landlord. Let it be noticed that if the poor rate remains as it is, no charge will be thrown upon the tenant under £4. Half the charge will be borne by the State and the other half borne by the landlord in the form of a fixed subtraction, not a varying subtraction, from his rent, depending, of course, upon the amount of the poor rate existing at the time that this reform was carried into effect. I hope I have made that fairly clear to the House, and that they will see that that very important point has not escaped the attention of the Government. Now I feel I have trespassed upon the House—[*general cries of* "No, no!"]—not so much indeed by the length of the statement, which I think has been as concise as the circumstances admit—["hear, hear!"]—but by asking the attention of the House to legislation which is not yet in being, and which cannot possibly be brought to their attention until we meet again in another Session—[An hon. Member: "Next Session?"]—next Session. It is, of course, a most unusual proceeding, for which I think an apology is required, but the House will see my reason. The reason is that as we have adopted this policy, the two essential elements of which are relief of rates in Ireland—general relief of rates on agricultural land in Ireland—and the establishment of popular local government in Ireland under circumstances which would prevent any of the financial abuses which have caused such widespread alarm among important sections of the community, the House will see that the policy consisting of these essential elements had to be explained before I could justify to the House the further announcement which they will no doubt have anticipated—namely, that the Irish Bills of my right hon. Friend, the Agricultural Industries Bill and the Poor Law Bill, cannot be proceeded with in the course of the present Session. We have adopted an alternative policy —[Mr. T. M. Healy: "Hear, hear!"]— inflicting, indeed, an incomparably larger charge upon the common Exchequer, but a charge which I am perfectly certain the country at large, and the Unionist Party in particular, will not grudge if they can see their way to carrying out the reform to which we are all pledged, the making of that change in Irish county government which certainly cannot be longer delayed, although it may take place under circumstances far less favourable than those which exist at present. Sir, I think that, for these reasons, the landlord and the tenant, the reformer, the politician, the Englishman, the Irishman, every class of the community, whether specially connected with Ireland or not, will be disposed to regard with favour—[Mr. T. M. Healy: "Hear, hear!"]—what I cannot but think will prove to be, all things considered, one of the greatest reforms carried out in the safest manner which have ever been suggested to the attention of this House. [*Cheers.*] I am, of course, ready to answer, if Mr. Speaker permits it, any question so long as it is not a question of detail, but in the meanwhile I hope I have with sufficient lucidity explained the general lines of the Government policy with regard to Ireland, and I cannot help hoping with some confidence that on all sides of the House that policy will meet with approval. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. EDWARD CARSON (Dublin University), rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely,

"the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury made this day with regard to the withdrawal by the Government of legislation proposed in reference to Ireland;"

The pleasure of the House having been signified,

Mr. CARSON said that every person who had listened to his right hon. Friend's statement would admit that in its bearing upon Ireland and the relations of this country with Ireland, no more important statement had been made in recent times. He wished to deal with that generous and sympathetic statement in the manner in which his right hon. Friend had made it. He would not discuss now the right hon. Gentleman's remark that Ireland in strictness had no claim to the money that he had announced he was prepared under certain circumstances to give in relief of the rates; it was enough for him to know that his right hon. Friend was prepared to give the money. But he thought anybody who had followed the course of events in Ireland since the recent Division on the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Londonderry, must have come to the conclusion that the Government had taken a wise course in reconsidering their position upon the question. That was a question upon which Irish Members of all sections were unanimous, and it was a question upon which public opinion in Ireland was also unanimous, and it would be received with much gratification to-morrow that at length the Government had agreed to give Ireland the same amount of relief in agricultural rates as they gave last year to England and Scotland. ["Hear, hear!"] He supported the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Londonderry upon the ground that he thought that as far as possible England ought to treat Ireland as one country with herself. The First Lord of the Treasury had said that if this money were given it could not be given with what he called the existing antiquated machinery. Speaking as a Unionist, he would like to see the same legislation apply to both countries as far as possible, but he should be very sorry if this antiquated machinery should be a reason for refusing this great relief to those engaged in agricultural pursuits in Ireland. The question of local government in Ireland was one that had, no doubt, been looked upon with great apprehension by many Unionists in that country, but he thought his right hon. Friend was perfectly correct when he said that a great deal of the resistance to the proposal hitherto made was made because no solution had been come to by which those who would be unrepresented would not have to pay the greater portion of the taxation levied by the local bodies. He now understood that the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to remove that apprehension by practically enacting that those who would be to a large extent, if not altogether, the representatives of the local bodies would be the persons who would have to bear the burden of the taxation. Under these circumstances, he thought it would be a narrow policy for Unionists to adopt to say they would offer any hostility whatever to the proposals for local government to Ireland. He agreed with his right hon. Friend that the present system of county government in Ireland had worked well and, he thought, economically, but he admitted it was out of date—["hear, hear!"]—and that sooner or later they must have local government in Ireland. In 1892, when his right hon. Friend proposed his Bill for the local self-government of Ireland, he spoke publicly in Ireland in favour of some such system, and he was glad his right hon. Friend had hit now upon some system by which they could, at least, look forward to having a Local Government Bill for Ireland which would not be cavilled at as putting any unnecessary safeguards upon it. He thought the time had come when they could look upon these proposals in a generous way. So far as he was concerned he should, in speaking of and discussing this question, do all he could to have an effective and proper Measure of local government in Ireland. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped the announcement his right hon. Friend had made as to the withdrawal of the Agricultural Industries Bill for Ireland did not mean that they were not to have that Bill in some form in the future. ["Hear, hear!"] He would suggest to him that when he was framing his Local Government Bill, and when he was reconsidering the position as regarded the Agricultural Department and Industries Bill, he might find his local councils in Ireland of very great use in enabling him to establish a more satisfactory system. He could only say that, upon such consideration as he had been able to give to the proposals of his right hon. Friend, they seemed to him to be not only statesmanlike, but entirely in accordance with Unionist principles, and it was as a Unionist Member that he would gladly support them. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. DILLON said it could not be expected that he should express any opinion on the proposals which had just been submitted to the House by the First Lord of the Treasury. He entirely agreed with the Member for Dublin University that the statement of the First Lord was one of the most important they had listened to from an Irish point of view for many a long day. [*Cheers.*] He refrained from expressing any opinion as to the important proposals submitted until he had had the opportunity of consulting with his colleagues and ascertaining their views. They were, as the First Lord had told them, to have until next Session to consider his very remarkable statement, and, therefore, there was no reason for being in a hurry to commit oneself for or against the proposals. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman one or two questions. He would like to know what he proposed to do with the money which had already been ear-marked for Ireland, and which was known as the equivalent grant. This was now suspended between heaven and earth, without, apparently, being allocated to any object. He would also like to know whether he proposed to apply the principle of an equal or really equivalent grant to Ireland in the present year, or whether he intended that Ireland should be content, so far as the present year went, with the sum of twice £75,000. With regard to the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, he desired to point out that of course the landowners of Ireland would get what he thought might very fairly be described as the lion's share of the grant in relief of rates.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): Less than one-half.

Mr. DILLON said he supposed it would have been considerably more, but he reserved his judgment on the point until a future occasion. But he desired to say that he should be prepared to make a considerable financial sacrifice for the sake of arranging a really democratic and liberal system of local government in Ireland. [*General cheers.*] Until they knew what kind of local government they were going to get, however, it was absolutely impossible for any Nationalist to state what would be his attitude towards the proposals. His own position would be largely influenced by the nature of the local government which was going to be offered, and if, as the price of a really democratic system, and one such as the speech of the right hon. Gentleman pointed to, they were asked to make some sacrifice which appeared to them even an unfair arrangement with regard to the landlords, he should be sorry to offer any opposition. [" Hear, hear ! "]

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said the statement of his right hon. Friend was one of the gravest character and, as far as he could see, without pledging himself in any way, he thought he and his colleagues would view it with satisfaction. [" Hear, hear ! "] He thought he could speak for some part of Ireland, and he felt that a scheme of county government such as had been adumbrated by his right hon. Friend would give very great satisfaction. [*Cheers.*] The only regret he had was that his right hon. Friend did not promise, on the part of the Government, to bring in a Bill next year on the lines of the one brought in by the Chief Secretary for Ireland this Session. He thought a Bill of that kind would have a very considerable effect in promoting the material prosperity of their country, and he hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would not think that because it would be necessary for the Government to bring in a Bill next year, perhaps of a complicated character, they would be forced to abandon the other Bill. [" Hear, hear ! "] He expressed his thanks to the Government for their promised scheme, which he believed would give great satisfaction. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) thought the First Lord of the Treasury might congratulate himself both on his statement and on the character of its reception. [" Hear, hear ! "] He thought everyone in the House would cordially endorse what the hon. Member for East Mayo had said — that, while the landlords would receive a substantial share of the bonus from the Government, there would be no opposition on that side of the House to their getting it on the understanding that the English system of franchise was conferred upon the people of Ireland. He should like to make one suggestion to the landlord party while that frame of mind continued—whether they could not fairly inaugurate the new era which they had opened up by the manner of the reception of the First Lord's statement by showing, in regard to those evicted tenants, who had been such a difficulty in the country, a slightly different temper from what they had done in the past. [" Hear, hear ! "] He would like to make one further remark to the landlord party. He was not grudging them the relief they would get. On the contrary, they helped them to get this relief, and he did not see why they should not share in the profits. [*Laughter.*] But he would impress on the Government that it would be well to drop this Inquiry into the Land Acts, seeing that the landlords were getting so large a sum as they were, and practically were getting it with the free will of that side of the House. His further remark was that, having struck a solid vein of common sense—and, as it was said, having struck it rich—he would suggest that the powers conferred on these local bodies should not only be large and ample in the English sense, but that they should be powers especially applicable to the case of Ireland. He thought the form of county government to be set up would enable them to deal with questions such as would have otherwise arisen under the Agricultural Board Bill, and now that Bill had been dropped he thought a great change would be made in the character of their policy. ["Hear, hear!"] The only other remark he would like to make was this. He believed that large economies could be made in the management and administration of Irish affairs. There were 159 Poor Law houses in Ireland, and in his opinion the number could be well cut down to 30 or 40. In Scotland there were only about 60. He believed that enormous reforms could be made by an improvement in the mode of collection all over the country, which was at present under a dual system; and he believed that the tenants would gain largely under the system proposed by the Government. He could only say that during his brief tenure of his seat in that House he had never known a Tory Government produce such a hopeful and auspicious statement of policy. [*Cheers.*]

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) said that though the important statement made by the First Lord of the Treasury primarily, of course, affected Irish Members, it also concerned England and Scotland. He congratulated his right hon. Friend on the manner in which his statement had been received by leaders of various Irish Parties, and he hoped it might not be out of place to say that he believed he would also have the support of Unionist Members representing English, and, he hoped, also Scotch constituencies. He should like to ask one question. He understood that the grant was fixed on the basis of past expenditures, so that any increase would fall on those responsible for it. [Mr. Balfour assented.] He was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman assent, because that, of course, was very important as a protection to the Imperial Exchequer. Of course, they could not now go into details, but he believed the proposals of the Leader of the House would receive the cordial and sympathetic support of Gentlemen representing English constituencies.

Mr. J. A. RENTOUL (Down, E.) desired to say just a few words. When the Local Government Bill of 1892 was brought before the House, he was much interested in it. He travelled over nearly the whole of Ireland, and met Grand Jurors of every one of the chief counties, and he put before them the nature of the English Local Government Bill, and asked each one of them:—

> "Supposing this Bill were offered to you exactly as it stands, what would you suggest in the way of safeguards and changes?"

He took down the answers of those Grand Jurors, and in every county he found that, with the exception of one single man, there was not a Grand Juror who would not have accepted the English Bill without a single safeguard of any sort, save in one particular, and that was in reference to the rates. They were afraid of that one thing. They found, for example, to take one Barony, which would probably be the area of the Local Government elections, that in this Barony there would be 35,000 electors, while quite one-half of the rates would be paid by 26 people. That being so it was perfectly clear that it was of the utmost importance to large ratepayers that economy should be exercised in the County Council. The one fear of those Grand Jurors—who were all landlords, he need not say—had been removed by the statement of his right hon. Friend the Leader of the House. They would have taken the English Bill without a single safeguard if it had been safeguarded in that one particular, namely, that the new County Council should not be allowed to strike a higher rate than the average rate say, of the preceding three or five years, or something of that sort. Now that fear, their sole fear, had been entirely taken away, as they themselves would not have to pay, as he understood, a single penny of the rates to be laid out by the County Councils. He hoped that when this Local Government Bill was brought in it would not contain a single safeguard that was not to be found in the Scotch or English Bill; that, in point of fact, the people of Ireland would be given to see that the local bodies were to be largely in the hands of the tenants, who would be the ratepayers, and that the landlords would have nothing to fear as regarded their own pockets. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Armagh in hoping very earnestly, though he was not sure they had much ground for hoping, that the Bill which had been promised by Government—the Agricultural Industries Bill—would not be dropped, but that they might have that boon also. He certainly would be glad for their own sakes if those who insisted on a Commission to try the Land Commissioners would accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Louth and would drop their demand for that Commission. ["Hear, hear!"] It was in the landlords' own interest entirely that he made the suggestion, because he firmly believed that the new Commission would be only a pat on the back for the present Land Commissioners, and that the reductions of rent they made after the Commission had reported would be greater and heavier than at present. He hailed with delight the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury, and he felt that there was not a single agricultural constituency in Ireland, whether Conservative or Home Rule, that would not gladly welcome it.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): It will be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the statement which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has made. It will be difficult, at the same time, to exaggerate the delicacy and the complicated character of the problem which the Government are going to attempt to deal with. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will be gratified, and let me say that in all parts of the House there will be gratification, that there appears to be opened up an avenue to something like an agreement among the different sides of Irish politics upon the subject. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not say a total agreement, but still an agreement in aim and intention; and I hope the statement will be received—I am sure I am justified in saying for hon. Members on this side of the House that we shall treat the proposals of the Government, as shadowed by the right hon. Gentleman, in no carping or grudging spirit. [*Cheers.*] At the same time, the right hon. Gentleman has done a thing which I imagine has never been accomplished before—he will probably acknowledge the fact himself, because he has made a great part of the Queen's Speech for next Session standing at that box in the month of May. [*Laughter.*] There is obviously one great advantage in thus forestalling the lapse of time. There is an admirable opportunity—and it will greatly assist, I believe, in the settlement of the matter—there is an admirable opportunity for the Government to place their proposals fully before the country before they come to be dealt with by Parliament. Of course, the success of the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, as my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo pointed out, depends largely, in fact almost entirely, upon the nature of the measure of local government to be granted to Ireland. We must all suspend our judgment upon the whole proposal until we know what is to be the character and the extent of the reform. ["Hear, hear!"] Now, would the Government be able before the end of the Session to produce a Bill for Irish Local Government—a Bill presenting their scheme, which with any modifications further experience might suggest would be the basis of their legislation next Session? There is an opportunity of doing it almost without example. The rest of this Session, as far as I understand it, will consist mostly of holiday. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues will therefore be relieved from close attendance in this House. They can thus devote their powers to the elaboration of this Bill. It will then be produced before the end of the Session, and everyone will be free to criticise it during the Recess. [*Laughter.*] The Government being a wise Government—[*Ministerial cheers*]—which, of course, we assume—[*laughter*]—will benefit by these criticisms, and next year will be able to introduce a Measure that will pass with very little difficulty through the House. [*Laughter.*] I draw that picture for the delectation of the right hon. Gentleman, and I think he will be well advised, seriously, if he takes the earliest opportunity of putting in shape his proposals for Irish local government, as it is clear that if those proposals are kept in the background, kept in the dark, public opinion on his scheme will have to be suspended during the whole of that time. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) wished to thank the Government for having relieved him of some anxiety. He had repeatedly pledged himself to give Ireland practically the same form of local government as they had in England. That was the great battle-cry to which, since 1885, he had pledged himself over and over again; and he had always felt it to be a somewhat serious matter that they had not attempted to carry it out.

He was extremely glad, therefore, that Ireland was about to be given local government, and he hoped to see it done on the English system, for that, as Lord Randolph Churchill used to say, was the real beginning of a final solution of the difficulties between the two islands. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he thought the First Lord of the Treasury was to be congratulated on the reception his statement had met with, not only on the Front Opposition Bench, but it might be safely said that every section of opinion in the House had been heard in the same sense. Certainly his memory would not enable him to recall any statement that had been made, either by a Conservative Government or by any other Government, which had been received with so universal an expression of agreement and satisfaction. ["Hear, hear!"] He had only risen to associate himself with the comments made from the Irish Benches upon the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury. That statement was, except in one particular, entirely satisfactory. So far as it included a certain amount of money to be given in relief of the landlords, he, for one, thought it would be exceedingly well spent if in return for that they got a free system of local government for the country, and they were bound to infer from the speech of the First Lord that the system of Government which was to be offered to Ireland would be a system of government of the fullest and freest kind, because he distinctly laid it down that the only reason which made it imperative upon him, according to his view, to insert safeguards in the Bill of 1892, would be entirely removed when the landlords had been relieved from the payment of these rates. ["Hear, hear!"] The only point he regretted in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was where he seemed to give the go-by altogether to the claim which was propounded in the Agriculture and Industries Bill of the Chief Secretary. The comments on that Bill in that House and in Ireland all went in the direction of adverse criticism of its financial provisions, and if those provisions were remedied, then he thought there would be a general feeling amongst Irishmen in favour of some such Measure being carried. ["Hear, hear!"] That was the view of the Recess Committee, which had been considering this matter, and upon which were representatives of every section of Irish political opinion, and he sincerely trusted the shelving of the Bill for the present did not mean its abandonment by the Government, but that in the near future they might see their way to introduce such a scheme again in an amended form that would secure for it general support. ["Hear, hear!"]

Sir R. PENROSE-FITZGERALD (Cambridge) observed that the right hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs had asked that some Member representing an English constituency should get up and say he was prepared to recommend the scheme of the First Lord of the Treasury to his constituency. He would respond to that challenge, and say he was confident that the scheme would be received, not only in his own constituency, but by the vast majority of the constituencies in England, with approval. ["Hear, hear!"] He said so for this reason—in the past, whether they had voted Unionist or Separatist, their main idea had been that full and free justice should be done to Ireland in all matters where it was possible. ["Hear, hear!"] He remembered going with a deputation from County Cork to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose when he was Chief Secretary, and pointing out to him that, although the deputation embraced men of all creeds and politics, there was absolute unanimity as to the object in view. The reply from the right hon. Gentleman was that he had remarked that when it was a question of money all Irishmen were absolutely united. [*Laughter.*] His reason for advocating this particular scheme was that this £700,000 a year was Irish money to which the country was entitled. The Grand Jury system was to be broken up, and although Grand Jurors in general had done their work with fairness, he recognised that the time had passed when they could have such a body as that, not elected by anybody, but nominated by the Sheriff. He did not look forward with any grave apprehension to the formation of these County Council Boards in Ireland, and he believed that this would prove to be one of the best Measures Parliament had ever passed with regard to Ireland. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. VESEY KNOX (Londonderry) was anxious to hear what the Government proposed to do with the money which was due this year to Ireland. He would not be particular about the form, so long as Ireland got the money, but he hoped the Government would consider the suggestions made by the right hon. Member for Dublin University and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford. Whether the Government would be able to put forward their Local Government Bill this year or not, he hoped that they would consult Irish opinion during the Recess upon many important questions of machinery and procedure, as, for instance, the organisation of a better system in connection with local loans in Ireland. If the Government would spend the Recess in ascertaining the opinions of all sections of Irishmen on these questions, it would save much valuable time when they brought this Bill before the House. The landlords of Ireland, when placed in positions of trust to represent the people, had shown themselves faithful custodians of the money and interests of the ratepayers, and he ventured to think that in many of these administrative and economic matters the Government would not do wrong in taking the opinion of the Irish people, including the landlords, before finally introducing legislation. This slightly deferred financial boon which it was proposed to give to Ireland was not a small one. So far as the tenant directly was concerned, it meant half the cess, and half the cess was more than equivalent to a reduction of 1s. in the pound of his rent. It was a reduction to be gained by all the tenants without exception, and without legal costs or proceedings. Therefore he believed that the Government would find throughout Ireland that their proposals would be received on both sides with the greatest gratification.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) suggested that the Government might, by a Technical Instruction Bill, do much to assist the large industrial centres of Ireland. Notwithstanding the adverse criticism that had been passed upon the Agriculture and Industries Bill of the Chief Secretary, the general opinion of Ireland, he believed, was in favour of it. If it were possible to secure, even tentatively, until the other Boards and machinery could be set up, the money granted to Ireland, he thought it most desirable that the Government should not postpone everything until next year, but should do as much as possible in the interval. As specially representing one of the large constituencies of Ireland, he asked the Chief Secretary to consider whether he could not grant some remedial measure in connection with technical instruction, and especially in the erection of buildings. In the large centres they were confined to a rate of a penny in the pound, and that penny was not enough to pay the interest on the buildings and to equip the schools. ["Hear, hear!"] But if the Government would give some assistance for the buildings, then the rate and the voluntary subscriptions would be sufficient to carry on this most valuable means of improving the condition of the people. He did not think that the First Lord of the Treasury, who had Scotch blood in his veins, would fall into the trap of launching his Bill before the right time. He thought that the reception of the Government's proposals augured well for the future relations of the three countries.

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that if the right hon. Gentleman were not yet convinced of the justice of the Irish claim, it was because he had not examined it sufficiently. Every reason which applied to England applied still more strongly to Ireland. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that "the antiquated system of local government" in Ireland would have to be swept away, not only in the counties, but at the centre. The control to be exercised at Dublin over the free popular bodies must be inspired more completely by Irish opinion if the bodies were to work well. He could not join other hon. Members in urging the Government to proceed with the Board of Agriculture Bill and the small Measures which they had conceived before they made up their minds to enter upon a policy of trusting the people. They should wait for the opinion of the people before setting up a Board of Agriculture in Ireland. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having grasped with boldness an excellent principle, and the right hon. Gentleman would have his best wishes in carrying his great programme to a successful issue.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY, who was received with cheers: In a very few words I can deal with the questions which have been asked me. With regard to the money which is already allocated to Ireland, Ireland will not lose it. There is a Bill hanging up that money which still stands.

MR. DILLON: Do you propose to apply it this Session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No; it will not be applied this Session. As to the claim of the hon. Member that the money, which would have gone to Ireland if the Bill had been passed this Session, should still go to Ireland, I am afraid that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not look with favour on a suggestion of that character. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER *made some remark, and* The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY *turned to catch the interruption, amid general laughter and cries of* "He does consent!"] I did not catch what my right hon. Friend said, but I see no sign of dissent on his part from the opinion which I have expressed. [*Laughter.*] There is one statement which I must make, in order that there may be no misconception, as to the nature of the relief of rating which is contemplated in the Measure, the outlines of which I have sketched to the House. We propose that the English analogy shall be followed in Ireland, and the rates dealt with will not be upon buildings, but upon agricultural land alone. [Mr. LOUGH: "Not on agricultural buildings?"] No; agricultural buildings are excluded from the English Bill; and there will be no difficulty in framing the Irish Bill to carry out all the objects which I have mentioned, and yet to confine the relief to agricultural land. Incidentally I may mention that the comparative value of Irish agricultural buildings is very much smaller than that of English agricultural buildings. ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Member for London University asked me whether the grant was to be a fixed grant. Yes, Sir, it is. That will save the Exchequer if the rates are to rise; and if the anticipations of the hon. and learned Member for Louth are fulfilled, and the result of this new administration is to produce economy, of course, the whole of the gain will go to the Irish occupier; and, in that event, the Exchequer will be paying more than half the rates, instead of the half which it will pay in the first instance. ["Hear, hear!"] I have further been asked what is to be the fate of the Agriculture and Industries Bill, and other Measures proposed by the Chief Secretary. I cannot help feeling a certain amount of surprise at the sudden affection which has been displayed for my right hon. Friend's proposals at the moment they have to be abandoned. [*Laughter.*] We never know how happy our lot is until it is changed; and we never value our gifts until we lose them. [*Cheers and laughter.*] I was a patient auditor of the Debate on the introduction of the Agriculture and Industries Bill, and I never could have conjectured that there was such enthusiasm pervading all ranks and sections of the House in favour of the Bill. [*Laughter.*] We still think that it is a Measure which would be very beneficial to Ireland; but now the funds for that Bill are to be allocated differently, and I can give no pledge as to the reintroduction of the scheme. The right hon. Gentleman opposite drew a rosy picture of the progress of Irish legislation next Session, if only it were given to an expectant country in the month of July this year. I do not know whether he is anxious to find a text for his autumn campaign, or whether he thinks a holiday is more agreeably spent in reading the clauses of a Local Government Bill than in—[*cries of* "Golf!"]—yes, than in playing golf. [*Laughter.*] But I can hold out no hopes that more material will be given for discussing the Irish policy of the Government than the ample fund of information which I have supplied this afternoon. The hon. Member for Londonderry expressed the hope that in the details of the Measure, especially those parts which were wholly uncontroversial, the Government would do their best to collect Irish opinion and to follow it. I can assure hon. Gentlemen on both sides that my right hon. Friend and myself will be delighted in the preparation of the Bill to receive any suggestions, from whatever quarter, which will tend to the perfection of the Measure. I think that covers the whole ground of the short and interesting Debate which we have had, and it only remains for me to thank hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who have in so sympathetic a spirit received proposals which we have honestly put forward as being in our judgment for the interest of every class in Ireland. [*Cheers.*]

MR. CARSON asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.

[NINTH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

[The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

CLASS II.

1. £114,389, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that he regretted to hear of the impending retirement of Mr. Cotton, one of the inspectors of the Board, under the "65 Rule." Mr. Cotton was a most faithful, zealous, and experienced public servant; he was the author of several works on local government and engineering questions; and it would be a great misfortune to lose his services under the "65 Rule." He hoped that the Treasury would arrange for an extension of Mr. Cotton's period of service.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.) desired again to direct the attention of the Chief Secretary to a matter which was of very considerable interest to a large number of ratepayers in Ireland, especially the ratepayers in the south of Ireland, namely, the unequal and inequitable manner in which the Exchequer grant in aid for the erection of labourers' cottages was allocated, by limiting its application to schemes carried out subsequent to 1891. He asked the Chief Secretary to reconsider his unfortunate decision, announced last Monday, that he would take no steps to remedy the injustice, for he ventured to say that in the annals of English administration in Ireland it would be difficult to discover a more palpable case of injustice than arose from the present arrangement. One would imagine that the application of the grant had been deliberately designed with a view to punishing those unions which had promptly taken advantage of the Labourers' Dwellings Act for the purpose of building cottages. In the province of Munster, which had set such an excellent example in this respect, no less than 60,192 cottages were built previous to the year 1891, or nearly twice as many as in all the rest of Ireland, and yet the majority of the Unions in the province would receive no relief whatever, because they had put the Labourers' Act into operation long prior to 1891. Two unions in his own constituency, Middleton and Youghal, were amongst the first to take advantage of the Act for the purpose of providing decent cottages for the labourers; and between the years 1883 and 1897, 206 cottages were built in Youghal at a cost of £26,000, and 198 in Middleton at a cost of £25,000. And yet because those unions carried out their schemes before 1891 they would not receive an allowance of one penny from this Exchequer grant, while those unions which in those years left the labourers in hovels unfit for human habitation were to be handsomely rewarded by receiving substantial aid from the grant. He felt confident that the mere statement of these plain, unvarnished, and undeniable facts could not but convince the Chief Secretary of the absolute necessity for taking some steps to remedy this very serious grievance by making the Act retrospective.

*MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.) said he desired to support very strongly the appeal of his hon. and gallant Friend. He found from the Returns of the Local Government Board that in the whole of the north-east of Ulster there was not one single labourer's cottage erected, while in the south and south-western districts very large numbers of cottages had been erected. From Clones to Larne and from Omagh to Newry not a single cottage had been erected, while in the union of Tipperary 435 had been erected; in Cork, 348; in Limerick, 461; in Waterford, 435; in

Kanturk, 336; in Cashel, 310; In Trim, 300; in Callan, 352; and in Navan, 305. It would be a great injustice, indeed, if the unions which had put the Labourers' Act into operation early should be deprived of the advantage of the grant-in-aid, and he appealed to the Chief Secretary to supply some retrospective provisions which would extend the relief to those unions that had erected cottages prior to 1891. He desired to discuss the general policy of the Local Government Board in Ireland. The announcement made that evening by the First Lord of the Treasury made it to some extent difficult for the Irish Members to discuss the matter at any great length, because they were promised changes in the system of Irish local government which would go a long way to remedy many of the things of which they had long complained. At present, Ireland was governed by three or four gentlemen who sat in the Custom House, Dublin, in different apartments, and who rarely, if ever, consulted the right hon. Gentleman who in virtue of his position as Chief Secretary was President of the Local Government Board. He had had occasion to approach the right hon. Gentleman on matters of Local Government Board administration; and he was astonished at the ignorance of the right hon. Gentleman in respect to things which were probably done in his name. The right hon. Gentleman had no idea of the very serious orders, many of them sealed orders, issued by his subordinates in Dublin, if they were his subordinates, very vitally affecting many sacred interests in different parts of the country. Last week he had to complain to him of the compulsory closing of the Ardagh (Co. Longford) Cemetery against the wishes of the inhabitants, and of the Longford Board of Guardians; yet, when he came to question him about it, the right hon. Gentleman knew nothing of the matter. He did not blame the right hon. Gentleman. He thought it was impossible for him to fulfil the many duties which were cast upon him in his diverse capacities in that House, and accordingly he did not blame him in the matter. He was there as the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and also as the President of the Local Government Board, and he did not seem to be consulted by the other Members of that Board with regard to the onerous duties which he was supposed to perform in connection with it. He hoped one result of the promise which had been made to them that evening would be that the present centralised system of management would be radically altered, and that something in the nature of popular control in connection with the central management would be inaugurated. He hoped that instead of half-pay colonels, or retired officers and navy captains, men would be appointed in whose interest in regard to the Poor Law the public had some confidence. He complained of the class of inspectors who were appointed under the system of the Local Government Board. Men more eminently unsuited to the discharge of the duties they were supposed to perform it would be almost impossible to find, and sometimes they treated the guardians with whom they were brought in contact with very little courtesy. He did not wish to pillory anybody, but his idea was that these gentlemen were simply wage earners, and did not care a straw about the grave duties they were called on to perform. He took the instance of the union of Belmullet, the people of which were recently brought face to face with starvation. The Local Government Board were wired to, written to, and memorialised on ever so many occasions to do something to relieve the distress, but it would scarcely be believed that the only sympathy they received from the central authority was that an inspector was sent down, who rode into the district on a bicycle one morning and left the next day. He took no pains to ascertain the actual condition of the people or to make a thorough inspection of their grievances, and made a report which was entirely opposed to the state of facts that existed in the locality. When the right hon. Gentleman was called upon to make a statement on the subject he said that the report was a confidential document. He thought it was a public scandal that in a matter of vital importance, where the lives of thousands of people were at stake, the right hon. Gentleman was not in a position to have the Inquiry which was called for openly and above board, and had to rely upon such a report as could be got in this haphazard way. If the inspector in that case had been a man who sympathised with the people there would have been no necessity for the Chief Secretary to have been ashamed of publishing the Report, and relief might have been brought where it was most sadly needed. He could mention other cases in which trouble had arisen, owing to the friction which had taken place from time to time between the guardians and the arrogant inspectors of the Local Government Board. He hoped in the promised reform some effort would be made to appoint these officers, not by political or Party favouritism, but according to their qualifications as proved by examination. With reference to the present workhouse system he cited the case of the county of Longford, in which there were three workhouses. These workhouses were built in 1837, the population of the county in 1841 being 126,000. The population to-day, however, was only 52,000, but there were still the same three workhouses, while the taxation had doubled or trebled since 1841. Nobody who had read the statements in the Irish medical Press last year and the year before would say that the condition of the inmates of the workhouses was a happy one. He repudiated the statement that their condition was due to a desire on the part of the guardians to treat the inmates harshly for economical reasons. The average Irish Poor Law Guardian was not disposed to be inhumane, but he was compelled to administer certain rules framed for him by the Local Government Board, and if harm was done it was the system that was at fault. He complained of the system of dietary in the workhouses, which was in most cases entirely unsuited to the unfortunate inmates. For the most part the food consisted of coarse bread and milk and a kind of greasy water called by politeness soup. The average cost of this food was 2s. 6d. to 3s. per head. At the same cost a scale of nourishing food could be substituted which though smaller in quantity, would be more suitable and nutritious. Then the so-called infirmaries in average Irish workhouses were little better than death traps. He had visited them, so did not speak from hearsay. The rooms without light, the hard, coarse kind of plank beds which the paupers had to lie on, and the want of proper ventilation and attendance, constituted a grave scandal. The Chief Secretary might say all this was the fault of the Poor Law Guardians. But when the guardians, from motives of humanity, tried to remedy it, the Local Government Board pounced upon them, disallowed the expense, and made them pay it out of their own pockets. According to the last report of the Irish Local Government Board in 1875, on a valuation of £13,500,000, £975,000 was collected in poor rates, averaging 1s. 5¼d., of which 1s. 1¾d. was spent in relief. In 1885 the valuation had gone up to £13,878,000, and the rates collected to £1,260,000. In 1895 £1,445,000 was collected for poor rate purposes being an increase of nearly £500,000 in twenty years. While between 1875 and 1895 the population of Ireland had decreased by more than a million, the taxation of Ireland for poor law purposes had increased to the extent of £500,000. The Irish Local Government system was undermanned and overworked. Duties had been cast upon it which did not rationally or properly belong to it, and proper machinery had not been provided for the proper discharge of these duties. At the present time, under the existing Poor Law system, they had to look after the relief of the poor, the administration of the Labourers' Acts, the Public Health Act, the Registration of voters (franchise), Registration of births, deaths, and marriages, the Towns Improvement Act, the Housing of Working Classes Act, and many minor matters which required separate attention. He agreed that some things must necessarily be neglected where so many had to be attended to. But some of the matters entrusted to the Poor Law Guardians were of the greatest importance. Nothing could be of greater importance than the public health of the country. The Public Health Act was worked in Ireland principally by dispensary medical officers. He did not complain of them. In many cases they did their work with a desire to benefit the community. But the Act required considerable amendments. There were many cases which could not be brought within its scope, which should be attended to, while hardships were inflicted under it with which their hide-bound system of officialism did not know how to treat. Then the Franchise Act struck at the root of our representative system. It was according to the discharge of the duties under the Act that election to this House took place, and elections to Boards of Guardians and Town Commissioners. How were the ordinary duties peformed under the Act? He asserted on his responsibility as a Member of Parliament, that to his certain knowledge in two cases out of five no franchise forms were served at all, and if served and collected, so inefficient was the system of registration that in a great many cases men were on the list who had been dead and gone for the last five or six years. The Nationalist Members from Ireland were certainly deprived of some portion of their grievances by the statement made earlier in the evening by the Leader of the House. But the poor law system in Ireland was a very antiquated system. It did not perform effectually by any means the duties entrusted to it by Act of Parliament. The very poor of the community were not properly relieved; whilst by the way in which the system was worked officialism took more than its due share of the money, and great changes must therefore be made before the Local Government Board system in Ireland would commend itself to the Irish people. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.) drew attention to the action of the Local Government Board in Ireland. He said he considered it was a most out of date and unsympathetic body, and endeavoured in most cases to flout the wishes and desires of the Boards of Guardians throughout the country. For instance, the Board of Guardians of the Dundalk Union wanted to carry out a main drainage scheme. A large sum of money was necessarily required for the scheme, and the Board desired to carry it out as economically as possible. The Hibernian Bank offered to advance the money at 3 per cent., whereas the old bank at which they kept their account wanted 5 per cent. as well as a mortgage on the property of the Union, and also to charge interest on the overdraft. The Board thought they could do nothing better than take the money from the cheapest source and save the ratepayers 2 per cent. thereby. They accordingly informed the Local Government Board that they proposed to take the money from the Hibernian Bank and to transfer their account to that bank; but the Local Government Board said "No!" The result was that they could not borrow from the cheapest source. It was surprising to think that such a thing could occur in any country. Another matter of which he wished to complain was the unwillingness of the Local Government Board to allow pauper children to be nursed outside. His point was that by placing the children out to nurse with families, they gained a good idea of industry, and it would be found that in most cases in which servants, whereas the children who were turned to the workhouse. They became part and parcel as it were of the family with which they lived, and became good servants, whereas the children who were retained in the workhouses seldom or never came to any good, and were only fit for the gaol or some other such place. He would therefore urge the Chief Secretary to consider seriously whether the Boards of Guardians ought not to have the power to send children out to nurse. In the end it would be found that it was cheaper to do so than to keep the children in the workhouses. ["Hear, hear!"] He had a further complaint to make on the subject in the appointment of Local Government Board inspectors. The gentlemen who were now appointed knew nothing of the work they had to perform, and nearly always had to seek instruction in their duties from some workhouse officials. There was at the present time a competition amongst the inspectors as to who could send in the longest report, and the Boards of Guardians were invariably put to great trouble and pressure in connection with their reports. He would suggest to the Chief Secretary that if possible there should be promotion from amongst the ranks of Union officials. If that were done the work of the Unions would be carried out much better than it was under the present system of appointing half-pay officers, or men who, owing to political influence, were put in the position of Local Government Board inspectors. ["Hear, hear!"] The next point he wished to call attention to was the question of the erection of labourers' cottages. He came from Ulster, and, so far as this question was concerned, he was sorry to belong to that part of Ireland. In all the counties of Ulster only eight or nine cottages had been built under the Act, while in Munster as many as 6,000 had been erected, and in Connaught 91. In Ulster the unfortunate labourers lived in hovels, in a state of dirt and misery. In answer to a question of his, the right hon. Gentleman said that there remained in the Treasury a sum of almost £12,000 that had not been used for the erection of cottages, and the greater portion of that sum should have been used in Ulster if the Boards of Guardians had done their duty. He would like to know why the Local Government Board did not compel the Boards of Guardians to do their duty in this respect? The right hon. Gentleman was responsible in that House for this state of things, and he hoped he would see that the Boards of Guardians in Ulster erected cottages when application was made to them. ["Hear, hear!"] If the right hon. Gentleman went through Ireland he could not fail to notice the vast difference between the condition of labourers who lived in cottages erected under the Act and those who did not. The difference that was to be noticed in the children of these two classes of people was extraordinary. The representatives of the tenant farmers in Ireland had been fighting in that House to obtain for them the possession of their own holdings, and while they did that it was also their duty to try and get for the labourers their own houses, as it enabled them to dispose of their labour to the best advantage. ["Hear, hear!"] There was another matter which very much affected the ratepayers of Ireland, and that was with regard to the deportation of paupers. He had for a long time past been questioning the right hon. Gentleman on this subject, but, he was sorry to say, with very little result. He could not help giving the Government credit for the reply—which he attributed to the hon. Member for South Tyrone—with regard to deportation. They were perfectly satisfied with that reply, which was that the Local Government Board would invite a conference on the subject with the Scotch and English Votes, so that they might arrange some way of preventing the deportation of Irish paupers. It was then found out, after long looking for, that it was owing to the Scotch Office, which declined to interfere in the matter. Anyone who heard the answer from the Scotch Office would think that it was the Concert of Europe that was proposed, instead of a conference of the three Local Government Boards. It was impossible that this matter could go on. It was so great a grievance in 1843 that Englishmen and Scotchmen protested against there being one law for them and another law for Irishmen. Lord Londonderry, of the time, and no one would doubt his politics, opposed heart and soul that paupers who had spent the best of their days in England and Scotland, should be deported back to Ireland to districts which had never profited by a farthing from them. But it was the same thing now with regard to financial grievances—the Irish Members were voted down. In 1843 a remarkable thing happened. It was the Liberals who passed the law which allowed Irish paupers to be sent back to Ireland, and in 1897 it was a Tory Government which would not give the relief due to Ireland on the financial relations question. Whether the Government was Liberal or Tory, it was prepared to defraud Ireland. He hoped they were going to have a brighter future for Ireland, and that after the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury he hoped this would be the last time that Irishmen would have to complain of a grievance which had been going on for 45 years. They were 45 years behind England and Scotland. Surely, as they paid an equal share of the taxes for Imperial purposes, they ought to have an equal share in the grants. If they went to a Division, he should, if necessary, move the reduction of the Vote by £10,000. This was no Party question. Besides affecting English ratepayers, it was an insult and a stigma on Ireland. He would mention another matter on this question. If a pauper removed from one part of Ireland to another, not a farthing of money could the Guardians spend to remove him back to his own union. If an Englishman or Scotchman became chargeable on any union in Ireland, not one penny of the ratepayers' money could be used to send him back; but from Great Britain the rates could be used to send a man back to Ireland. Now this was an injustice.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said the hon. Member could not discuss English and Scotch matters on this Vote. That was not the proper time to discuss this grievance.

MR. DALY said the Local Government Board had taken action in this matter, and he thought there was no other occasion when this matter could be brought forward.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) called attention to the subject of dispensary doctors, who were not now of a character on which the remote districts could be congratulated. He did not insinuate that the right hon. Gentleman or his Department were in any way responsible for the present state of things, because everybody knew that the appointments of dispensary doctors were vested in the Dispensary Committees of Boards of Guardians. Often local and family prejudices prevailed and good men had little chance of appointment. He hoped that in any scheme of local government for Ireland the question of the appointment of dispensary doctors would not be overlooked, and that it would be placed in the hands of the County Councils or some larger bodies than the present Dispensary Committees of Boards of Guardians. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that the tramp question was as difficult a one in Ireland as in England. He could not help thinking, however, that some, at least, of the difficulty would disappear in Ireland if the Guardians enforced the rules more stringently.

MR. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.) thought it would be found that in the appointment of dispensary doctors in Ireland much the same condition of things prevailed as in England. In opening the discussion his hon. and gallant Friend drew attention to the way in which the money allocated to Irish purposes was given to the different Boards of Guardians. The reply the Chief Secretary gave the other day on this point did not commend itself to any man of justice. The Labourers' Cottages Act was passed in the early eighties, and many Boards of Guardians undertook to erect cottages under the Act. A grant was now being given to Boards of Guardians according to the number of cottages being erected. No heed, however, was paid to the cottages erected prior to 1891. That was manifestly unfair, indeed it amounted to the putting of a premium upon Boards doing little or nothing. The machinery of the Act was complicated and cumbersome, and it was only just that those Boards who undertook to put it in operation should have some benefit from their enterprise and that the ratepayers of the localities should not be fined on account of the Act being administered. As to the working of the Act he noticed from the Estimates that there were a certain number of inspectors employed by the Local Government Board, and also a certain number of engineering inspectors. When money was advanced on loan to the Boards of Guardians, the Local Government Board insisted that their inspectors should visit the cottages and see that the money had been fairly laid out. At present there were only two engineering inspectors, and the number of cottages erected, particularly in Munster and Leinster, was very great, with the result that the different Boards of Guardians were asking month after month that inspectors should be sent down to see the cottages, but were being informed by the Local Government Board that they had not sufficient staff. He was not anxious to increase the staff of the Board, but means should be found by which the cottages erected could be officially inspected. There was another point connected with labourers' cottages which he desired to mention. Several Boards of Guardians, especially in Munster, had been anxious to be empowered to give small prizes with a view to encouraging labourers to keep their cottages and garden plots in order. For some reason or other the Local Government Board had always set their faces against the idea. He did not mean to say that the cottages were badly kept now, but the offering of such prizes would, he was sure, do good. In Connaught many of the ratepayers were as poor as the labourers, and, therefore, he thought the Treasury might do something to lessen the rate of interest on the money lent. In connection with the Vote there was another matter he wished to call attention to. One of the duties of the Poor Law Commissioners was to prepare the Parliamentary and other registers. The present system of preparing the Parliamentary register in counties was absurd. In towns and cities the register was prepared by sheets, and alphabetically by sheets the system worked well. He had already brought in a Bill providing for the preparation of the Parliamentary register by townlands.

No question of Party was involved, but the change proposed would relieve the clerks of unions of a great deal of trouble, simplify the preparation of the register, and make the register more exact. The hon. Member for South Leitrim had tried his best to get the Bill through, but it was always blocked, and he believed that the Attorney General for Ireland was opposed to the Bill. What the right hon. Gentleman's reasons were for opposing it he did not know, and he trusted they would be stated.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing an alleged grievance that could only be remedied by legislation, and, as I have repeatedly reminded the Committee, subjects for legislation cannot be discussed in Supply.

Mr. P. J. POWER said that there was no more dismal reading than the statistics published by the Local Government Board, because they showed that the population of Ireland was decreasing, while taxation was increasing. In England there was, on the contrary, an increasing population and decreasing taxation. Allusion had been made to the question of the boarding out of children. He had some experience in Poor Law administration, having been chairman of a large Board of Guardians for some 15 years, and he could corroborate what had been said by the hon. Member on that subject. The system prevailed to a large extent in his union, and he could hardly call to mind a single case of a child's returning to the union after it had been sent out to nurse. Of course, supervision was necessary, and the people to whom children were sent must be respectable. He believed that in 99 cases out of 100 the child was regarded as a member of the family to which it was sent, and in many cases it was given the family name. The system had worked well in Waterford Union, and he hoped to see it extended. The administration of the Poor Law in Ireland compared favourably in many respects with its administration in this country. He had often heard it said that Nationalist and Catholic Board of Guardians in Ireland behaved with intolerance towards the Protestant minority, but he did not believe that the allegation could be substantiated. In the Waterford Union there were only some 12 non-Catholic inmates. They had a ward and matron to themselves, and a respectable salary was paid to a clergyman of the Church of England who administered to their spiritual wants. A room had been specially prepared at a cost of about £100 for the Protestant services. An example of that kind might, he thought, be imitated with advantage in English unions in which there were Catholics. In conclusion, he asked the Chief Secretary to do what he could to facilitate the working of the Labourers' Act, and urged that it was desirable to appoint more inspectors to superintend the erection of cottages and to see that the money devoted to the purpose was properly expended.

Mr. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said that they had all welcomed the announcement made that day by the First Lord of the Treasury, to the effect that a new system of local government was to be established in Ireland. The antiquated machinery, as it had been called, that now existed had been the means of debasing public life in parts of Ireland. In consequence of the system of proxy voting, and of *ex-officio* members, the local boards in Ireland were not under the control of the majority of the people in a district. They were in the hands of cliques, and were ruled by the officials of the Departments. He knew some Boards in which the Clerk to the Union was paramount. In these Boards if any independent member tried to remedy abuses the Clerk managed to get rid of him by playing upon the prejudices and partisan proclivities of the landlords and others. That was possible, because under the proxy system one landlord had more than 30 votes, while the ordinary ratepayer had only one. They wanted a system through which the fresh air of public opinion could blow. The hon. Member for Yarmouth seemed to think that there ought to be further restraints upon public control, and that in remote districts the people, through the Dispensary Committees, ought not to be allowed to select their own medical officers; but when matters had been taken out of the hands of the people's representatives and transferred to the Local Government Board, the change had always been for the worse. The administration of the Franchise Acts in Ireland illustrated his objection to the retrogade proposals of the hon. Member for Yarmouth. By these Acts it was provided that once every year forms should be issued to every ratepayer, so that a return might be supplied of everyone entitled to be put upon the register. The officials were formerly paid according to the number of notices they issued and the number of names appearing upon the lists. In places where the people were all of the same way of thinking politically, there was really no necessity for sending out these forms, and the Guardians did not insist that the notices should be served. The Local Government Board, however, influenced by the representations of their officials, who wanted to make more money and who thought it a hardship that they should have to go to the Guardians for payment under the Franchise Acts, and that the Guardians should be entitled to refuse payment when no work had been done, instituted a new system, under which these officials were paid very highly. What was the result? In districts in Westmeath, Longford, Roscommon, and Sligo the officials, knowing that their salaries were fixed, issued no new notices at all, and allowed the registers to remain neglected. The Guardians and ratepayers were, therefore, now paying for work that was not done. He urged upon the Chief Secretary to inquire into this matter, in the interests of the ratepayers of Ireland and of the British Treasury. There was another matter to which he wished to call attention. The gentlemen who were appointed as Poor Law Inspectors varied their policy under different Governments. When a Liberal Government was in power they were as mild as sucking doves, but when a Tory Government was in office they acted like autocratic pro-Consuls determined to wipe out from existence Boards of Guardians that were not very civil and humble. The Athlone Union, for example, was dissolved because the Nationalist chairman of the Board was not sufficiently respectful to the Poor Law Inspector, but in the adjacent Union of Mullingar the Inspector was treated deferentially, and the consequence was that things were done in that union which would not be permitted elsewhere. He had put a Question to the Chief Secretary that day with regard to affairs in that Union, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would admit that his reply was a practical admission of the grave charges he embodied in that Question, and demanded some sort of inquiry or action on his part. Take the medicine contract. The Clerk of the Union issued two classes of advertisements, one in the local papers and another in the Dublin papers. In the advertisement published in the local papers it was made a condition that the firms tendering should send in a letter saying they were tendering. There was no such absurd condition mentioned in the Dublin papers, and, consequently, when the tenders from Dublin or Cork, or Sligo came in, the clerk held that they were informal because they had not complied with this condition, and they were never opened. The contract was given to the local contractor, in whose employment was the brother of the Clerk of the Union. The attention of the Local Government Board Inspector was called to the matter, and a sworn Inquiry was held. It was then found that, while the local contractor had charged £71 1s. for some of the items, the price given by Messrs. Leslie in their tender for the same items was only £40 10s. 11d. The result was that practically £300 or £400 was simply given away to the local contractor. What else happened? "Extras" had to be charged according to the ordinary Dublin wholesale houses' list. There was no wholesale list in this case, and the local contractor made up a wholesale list of his own and charged accordingly; and this clerk passed it. The Local Government Board, in their Report, found that the local contractor had been paid large sums for "extras" which he was not entitled to and they decided that he was unfit to have the contract. Advertisements were again issued last year, and again Dublin, Cork, and Sligo houses tendered, as well as this local contractor, and again, through the friends of this clerk, the contract was voted to the same person, in spite of the finding of the Local Government Board that he was unfit to hold a contract in that Union. In their Report last year the Local Government Board said that—

> "After a careful consideration of all the facts of the case, and having regard to the gross system of overcharging practised, they have come to the conclusion that the local contractor should not be entrusted with the supply

of the medicines, and the Board must accordingly request that the Guardians will forthwith give notice to cancel the contract."

In face of these facts the right hon. Gentleman said the Local Government Board had no power to dissolve the contract.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Certainly not.

Mr. TULLY said that he understood it so. Then with regard to the administration of outdoor relief in the same Union. An independent Committee, which inquired into the matter, found that—

"about £1,000 a year is distributed by the relieving officer in the electoral division of Mullingar, which has put 1s. 8d. in the pound on that division, and that a considerable amount of this outdoor relief is spent in the public houses."

The Union was paying 2s. a head for outdoor relief, whereas in Belfast it was done at 1⅞d. per head, and in North Dublin at 4½d. per head. In the adjoining Union of Athlone, with almost the same population as Mullingar, the outdoor relief was only 8½d. per head of the population. The list of those who received outdoor relief showed that in many cases it was given to persons who had absolutely no claim to it. This Committee found that the list of persons who received relief should be printed quarterly and distributed among the ratepayers and posted all over the districts, but that this had not been done for a considerable time past. This was through the default of the Clerk of the Union. He thought these things were sufficient cause for personal inquiry by the Chief Secretary, for he was sure he would not tolerate any such scandal in any Union. Then with regard to the administration of the Sanitary Acts in Ireland, he thought that in any future legislation greater power should be given to the local authorities which might be set up under the machinery promised by the First Lord of the Treasury. At present the Sanitary Acts in very large parts of Ireland were practically a dead letter, owing to the limited powers of the magistrates and the guardians. He welcomed the announcement of the Leader of the House that the antiquated machinery which had produced some of the evils he had put before the House was about to be abolished, and that they were going to get something in the shape of local government as it existed in England and Scotland, which would let a little fresh air and public opinion into the affairs of Ireland.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said that the discussion had travelled over a large and varying area, and he would do his best to reply to the points raised. Complaint had been made that the Exchequer contribution applied retrospectively only to the year 1891. The law as it stood did not allow the application of this money to the case of cottages sanctioned before 1891, and this year had been chosen for the application of the money because it was the first year when the money was granted by Parliament as being available. He was aware that almost all the schemes carried out by the guardians in the south of Ireland had been carried out prior to 1891. But the purpose of Parliament was to encourage the building of cottages, and if the application of the money had been made retrospective to all the cottages built since the Labourers' Acts began it was clear that there would have been a far less sum of money available to encourage building cottages in other parts of Ireland. Next, complaint had been made of the administration of the Local Government Board, and particularly that the Local Government Board acted in practical independence of the Parliamentary authority of the Chief Secretary. No doubt there were a considerable number of instances in which the Local Government Board considered that it was entitled to act without consulting the Chief Secretary. It must be obvious that if the Chief Secretary was to be consulted by the Local Government Board on every question which arose, however minute and controversial, it would be a very great waste of time of the Chief Secretary. If cases arose where the Local Government Board appeared to have acted without due discretion, and those cases were brought to the attention of the Chief Secretary, they would be immediately inquired into. He did not think that it could be shown that there were many cases, even any, in which the Local Government Board had acted on its own responsibility without consulting the Chief Secretary in a matter of controversial character. As to the Armagh cemetery, he believed that the actual issue of the Order was suspended for a time, but the decision was come to in the time of his predecessor. The vague accusations which had been made against the inspectors were difficult to meet, but he could not say that he had many, or even any, complaints before the present as to the scant courtesy shown by the inspectors towards the Boards of Guardians. Nor was it correct to say that the inspectors did not take interest in their work. The Belmullet Union and the case of the inspector had been referred to, but the Report which he had received from Mr. Robinson could not be laid on the Table of the House because it was a confidential document. As to the workhouse system, he would be the last to say that he was satisfied with that system in Ireland. He had brought in a Bill the object of which was to make a thorough reform of that system in Ireland possible. It was impossible to pass that Measure this year, but he hoped sooner or later to see an amalgamation of unions which would be likely to form the best foundation for workhouse reform in other directions. The Local Government Board was continually trying to improve its administration, and he could not say that many complaints had come before him to show that the strictures of hon. Members as to dietary, ventilation, and so forth were justified. As to the desirability of adopting the system of boarding-out workhouse children, he thought its extension to Ireland would be of the greatest possible benefit, and he had included it in the Bill introduced by himself this year. ["Hear, hear!"] It was said the Boards of Guardians were overridden by the Local Government Board, and that the inspectors were engaged in rivalry as to who should suggest the most extensive and expensive works. It was absolutely inaccurate to say that there was any desire on the part of the Local Government Board to override the Boards of Guardians, nor could he admit that the inspectors were open to the charge of making recommendations intended to annoy the Boards of Guardians. It was an absolute travesty of facts. He was bound to put on record that he believed the inspectors did their duty, often difficult and delicate, in a most efficient manner. As to the suggestion that the inspectors should be appointed from the same class as the Guardians, he held that it would be unsound in principle to select men for positions of authority from the class they were to control, and he did not think that the Poor Law system of Ireland or the public interest would gain if the inspectors were drawn from a class below in intelligence and education that from which they were drawn at present. He now came to the question of the deportation of paupers. He was sorry if he had given the hon. Member for Monaghan any occasion to complain of any answer he had given him. He trusted he had never been guilty of anything like intentional discourtesy. But it was just possible that he had got tired of answering questions which drove him to say the same thing over and over again, and if he had unintentionally fallen into any apparent want of courtesy he apologised. ["Hear, hear!"] But when the hon. Member said that in this matter of the deportation of paupers Ireland was 45 years behind England and Scotland, and blamed the Government for not bringing Ireland up to a level with England and Scotland, he might remind him of what he said when the question was raised in the Debate on the Address—viz., that, in his (Mr. Balfour's) opinion, it was not a question of bringing Ireland up to a level with England, but rather the other way. It was rather the English, and still more the Scotch, system that cried out for alteration. If he received a universal expression of opinion from hon. Members for Ireland that in this matter of the deportation of paupers the law of Ireland should be changed so as to enable English and Scotch paupers to be deported from Ireland in the same way as Irish paupers were deported from England and Scotland—[*cries of* "No!"]—he should say that in his judgment they were making a mistake. Still, he would carefully consider such a suggestion. But he was helpless unless he had the co-operation of the Local Government Boards of Scotland and England.

Mr. DALY: Are they all under the same Government—English, Scotch, and Irish?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No doubt they were under the same Government. But, as hon. Members knew, the law was not actually the same in the three countries, and no Minister for one part of the kingdom could act as if he was perfectly independent of the Ministers for the others. This matter must rest, in the first instance, with the Local Government Boards. Unless the Scotch Local Government Board consented to an alteration of the law such as would satisfy Ireland, he was powerless. But negotiations were going on, and he did not despair of their being successful. But it was not the fault of the Irish Local Government Board that the desires of hon. Members opposite were not given more speedy effect. [An hon. Member: "Nor of the English?"] Nor of the English. ["Hear, hear!"] A complaint had been made of the deterioration of the dispensary doctors. The alleged deterioration had been denied by the hon. Member for East Waterford. He was not able of his own knowledge to offer any opinion on the matter, but hon. Members might be assured that it should have his consideration. It was impossible, however, to suggest that the appointment of the dispensary doctors should be taken out of the hands of the properly constituted authority. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for East Waterford made a suggestion on which he should like to say one word. He said that he thought it desirable that prizes should be offered by Boards of Guardians for the best kept labourers' cottages. Well, it might be a very good thing if prizes were offered for the best kept labourers' cottages. But it did not seem to him that that was an expenditure which should come out of the rates. It should be rather a matter for local effort. He thought it would be a very good thing indeed if private subscriptions were raised for such a purpose, as was done in many parts of England and Scotland, for it tended to give the labourers an interest in their cottages, and undoubtedly had the effect of raising their morale generally. ["Hear, hear!"] Coming to the speech of the hon. Member for South Leitrim, who made a series of charges against the Local Government Board, he thought it could hardly be expected that he should deal with them in detail. It was absolutely necessary to have warning beforehand of such matters as he had raised.

Mr. TULLY: I asked the right hon. Gentleman several questions.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes; and I answered those questions. It appeared to him most extraordinary that the hon. Member should have raised the question of the suspension of the Board of Guardians for Athlone. That matter was discussed amply when the Vote was before the House last year. The hon. Member ventured to say that the Athlone Board was wiped out because it would not submit to the will of the inspector. He did not know whether the hon. Member was present when that matter was discussed last year. Had he been present, he did not think he would have made the charge he had now made. The details had to a certain extent escaped his memory; but he did remember this, that the Board of Guardians at Athlone was removed because of their persistent refusal to appoint trained nurses, a refusal which produced disastrous results. He made a most ample and explicit statement of the action of the Local Government Board in connection with this matter last year, and after that explanation he did not think a single Member on either side of the House ventured to rise in support of the Athlone Board of Guardians, and the Motion on the subject was withdrawn. He did not wish to use strong language, but he certainly thought that a great many of the charges which were made against the officials in Ireland, whether of the Local Government Board or other departments, should not be brought forward without more careful inquiry into the facts. Those gentlemen were not present to defend themselves; their case had to be left in his hands. It did not assist officials to discharge the onerous duties which were thrown upon them to know that in this House there were so many Members who came forward and made charges against them which, the moment they were investigated, hopelessly broke down.

*Mr. Serjeant HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) expressed disappointment that the Chief Secretary had held out no hope of any immediate remedy on the question of deportation. It was a crying grievance, and it was not sufficient to say that because one Department in the same Government threw some difficulty in the way of other Departments, there could be no legislation. The Government, if they came to the conclusion that the law required reform, could compel the Scottish Local Government Board to acquiesce in the general views of the Administration.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Why did not you do it when you were in office?

*MR. SERJEANT HEMPHILL: Why? He believed there was a Bill actually prepared, but owing to that unfortunate vote about cordite—[*laughter*]—there was not an opportunity of submitting that Bill to the House. But unquestionably it was a crying grievance and ought to be promptly remedied. The question of deportation stood by itself and was not involved in the general question of Poor Law administration. A repeal of certain sections of some Acts of Parliament would obviate the difficulty and deprive the guardians of Glasgow or any other large town in Scotland or England of the power of deporting Irish paupers simply because Ireland happened to be the place of their birth.

MR. DAVID SHEEHY (Galway, S.) condemned the reply of the Chief Secretary as very unsatisfactory. At present, some unions were suffering for the diligence with which they had put in force an Act passed by this House. Was that a way to encourage them to diligence? The unions that put the Act in force for the first seven or eight years were to be excluded for that period from all the advantages offered by the Act, and that was an injustice. The question of the deportation of Irish paupers from English and Scotch workhouses was also a crying grievance, and yet, although the grievance was brought forward year after year, nothing was done to redress it.

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) referred to the large number of labourers cottages which had been built by the guardians in the various unions of Munster, and said he did not think the Chief Secretary had gone sufficiently far in his promise to look into the matter, if he did not take into account the cottages erected prior to 1891, and give some remuneration to the unions which had provided them. In this connection he read a petition from the Trade Union, addressed to the Chief Secretary, stating that under the Labourers' (Ireland) Acts, 1883 and 1885, petitioners erected 156 labourers' cottages, at an expenditure of £17,000, being one of the first unions to avail of the Acts, the district having been greatly benefited by the erection of the cottages. The ratepayers of the district had, at the same time, undertaken large liabilities and heavy yearly payments which exceptionally increased the rates on the already over-burdened ratepayers:

"A great deal of public discontent has been caused throughout the entire Union by the announcement that other unions, in which some cottages have been built under the Labourers' Acts, subsequent to the year 1891, would now receive substantial relief by way of contribution from the Exchequer grant of £40,000 a year, towards the erection of labourers' cottages, while this union, where cottages had been more largely built in the preceding years, as well as the other unions—the large majority—that voluntarily availed of the original Acts before the year 1891, would get no relief whatever from this or any other source. Your petitioners believe that the mere statement of this fact, without any enlargement on the inequality of the distribution, or the hardship of the case, will sufficiently justify this memorial. Your petitioners therefore submit that they are justly entitled to relief in the proportion of their expenditure equally with any other union in Ireland, and claim that further legislation, if it be necessary, should be introduced to give effect to their just claims."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: From that statement it appears that further legislation would be necessary, and, that being so, the matter cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

MR. FLAVIN: They do not say that further legislation is necessary, but that if it be necessary. It is a question of opinion.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: It is obvious that further legislation would be necessary.

MR. FLAVIN said he would merely remark on this head that many other unions had adopted similar petitions. The Chief Secretary had stated that England, Ireland and Scotland were the three branches of the one Government, but on the question of the deportation of paupers he did not for the life of him see why Ireland should be treated on a different basis to England and Scotland. He felt as an Irishman that it was a great injury to his countrymen that they were not allowed to send back to England or Scotland the Scotch or English pauper who was living in Irish workhouses at the expense of the Irish ratepayers, while English and Scotch officials were allowed to send back to Ireland a pauper who happened to be Irish born, so that he became a burden to the Irish workhouse.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: That point has already been raised two or three times, and on every occasion I have called the hon. Member so raising it to order, pointing out that this can only be altered by legislation, and, therefore, cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

MR. FLAVIN did not intend to continue the discussion on that point, and he would proceed to a matter which had been brought to the attention of the Chief Secretary by a dozen and a half or two dozen resolutions, namely, the great distress which existed in the Listowel Union. The first resolution adopted by the Listowel Board of Guardians with reference to the distress was passed in the middle of November last. They then saw that, owing to the failure of the crops, distress must inevitably ensue. They summoned a special meeting to consider the matter, and after due consideration of the facts they adjourned the meeting and asked for a complete report from the *ex officio* as well as from the elected members of the Board, from Catholic as well as Protestant clergymen, from Conservative, Liberal, and Nationalist alike. They furnished their report to the Clerk of the Union, who forwarded a copy to the Chief Secretary for Ireland as President of the Local Government Board. After considering that report, the right hon. Gentleman was asked a question in the House of Commons on the 13th February as to whether, owing to the great distress, some relief works could not be started or assistance given to the Union. In reply, the right hon. Gentleman stated that careful inquiry had been made as to the condition of the poorer classes in the Listowel Union, and the conclusion had been arrived at that it would not be necessary to supplement the resources of the Poor Law by starting relief works. As far as he himself could see, the resources of the Poor Law Board were simply to increase the present rate of taxation, which was already sufficiently heavy, the rate in the Listowel Union, exclusive of a water rate for Listowel town, being 13s. 6d. in the pound. It was true that the inspector of the Local Government Board had reported that there was no practical distress, but this was entirely opposed to the report of all the Guardians, Protestant and Catholic, Unionist and Nationalist. *Ex officio* Guardians, like the late Mr. George Hewson, like Major Kidgell and Captain Leslie, reported that there was great distress. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to contradict the statements which he had read. How could the evidence of an official who had spent all his life in Dublin be set against the evidence of all these persons in the locality?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the statements read by the hon. Member consisted principally of expressions of opinion from those who would be benefited by the expenditure of the money.

MR. FLAVIN said that he had a personal knowledge of all these questions, or he would not bring them before the right hon. Gentleman. On the 28th January, the Listowel Board of Guardians sent a resolution to the right hon. Gentleman asking that relief works might be established owing to the great distress. On the 4th February and the 25th February they sent other resolutions, and on the 25th March they sent a final resolution urging that a loan of seed oats was of the greatest necessity.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that he did not decline to make a loan, but pointed out that if such a loan was to be made, legislation would be required. He said that he was prepared to consider the necessity of legislation if there was a general desire for it among the Unions of the West of Ireland.

MR. FLAVIN asked what the unfortunate Listowel Union was to do in the meantime? The right hon. Gentleman had done nothing for the district or the county, and the Listowel Board believed that they had a right to have their case heard on its merits. The right hon. Gentleman had not an intimate personal knowledge of the country. When he visited it, he associated with the wealthier class, and however kind and sympathetic he might be, he could not know how the poor people lived.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said that he failed to see how this was relevant to the Vote for the Local Government Board.

MR. FLAVIN said that his contention was that distress existed in the Union, and ought to be met.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said that the only way of meeting it suggested by the hon. Member was by a grant of money, which would require legislation, and could not, therefore, be discussed in Committee of Supply.

MR. FLAVIN said that his argument was that it was absolutely impossible for the local authority to meet this distress, for the rates were now 13s. 6d. in the pound. He hoped that the Chief Secretary would consider the case of those poor men who had seven or eight children to support, and who did not earn as much as 8s. a week all the year round.

[After the usual interval, Mr. GRANT LAWSON took the Chair.]

*MR. J. PINKERTON (Galway) appealed to the Chief Secretary that the Exchequer grant of £40,000 for the erection of cottages under the Labourers' Acts allocated to unions in the north of Ireland, where there was no desire evinced to put the Acts in operation, should be spent in unions in the south and west, where labourers' cottages were being largely built and were much needed. In Ballymoney and Coleraine no applications had been made for cottages. Yet if it were proposed to the guardians of those unions that the money should be spent in the south and west they would strongly oppose it. This was a "dog in the manger" policy. With regard to the conduct of the Poor Law officials in Ireland, he considered that, on the whole, they acted fairly and squarely in transactions between the guardians and the Government. He did not agree with the hon. Member for West Cavan that the lot of the inmates in workhouses had been made harder by the action of the Poor Law Inspectors. In Ballymoney the inspectors recommended that the paupers should have knives and forks, washstands and wardrobes. These things would make the standard of comfort in the workhouse greater than it was outside. Many of the ratepayers did not possess knives and forks, washstands or wardrobes. Many of them had not even pegs on which to hang their clothes. As to the appointment of paid nurses, he was anxious that the paupers should be treated with the greatest kindness, and that everything should be done to improve the condition of the aged and infirm, but it pressed hardly on the ratepayers when three trained nurses were appointed to do the work of one, assisted by the inmates, and when rooms were built and furnished to accommodate the nurses. The ratepayers were poor people and while they were anxious to make the people as comfortable as possible they had no desire that a set of useless officials should be appointed to meet the demands of the medical inspectors. This agitation in favour of paupers did not start with the ordinary inspectors. The doctors throughout Ireland were the first to raise a howl of indignation that the paupers were not properly treated. For his part, he feared the pendulum would swing too far. Money not required for labourers' cottages in the northern unions should be spent in the south and west. But not a single guardian in Ballymoney or Coleraine would release his grasp on a single penny that might otherwise cross the Boyne. There were Poor Law divisions from which not a single inmate was in the workhouse. Yet the rates charged on those divisions fell little short of other divisions when there was a considerable number of inmates in the "house." Money had not been spent legitimately, but upon a system of fostering officials. He had no desire to increase the number of officials or the red tapeism of their Department. Instead of agitating for a system which would entail further expense on the ratepayers, he would prefer to see the system modified in such a way as would entail no suffering on the inmates of workhouses, and prevent the waste of public money. The conditions of life in the southern aud western unions were entirely different from those of life in the northern unions. No one who had travelled through the south and west of Ireland could say that labourers' cottages were not required there. Yet the Government were putting a stumbling block in the path of progress as regarded the south and western unions in the interests of a part of the country which did not need a penny of the £40,000 reserved. He trusted the Chief Secretary would reconsider the matter and grant some concession to the southern and western unions.

Dr. R. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.) said he would not follow the Chief Secretary in his praises of inspectors of workhouses in Ireland. He would refer to the distress that existed in certain parts of Ireland. No person, it had been said, was in receipt of relief in the Westport Union, but in February last there were 1,320 persons relieved, which, compared with 608 in February 1896, showed an increase of 712. Nothing had been done to relieve this distress. In Achill in February 1896, 46 persons were in the receipt of outdoor relief, whereas the number in February 1897, was 417; a difference of 371. It was not only in the Westport Union that the burden was felt, but throughout the whole of County Mayo. In 1841 the population of the county was 388,887. In 1891 it was 219,034, a decrease, in the course of 50 years, of 169,853. Yet he found that the Poor Rate had almost doubled. In 1886 it was 9d.; in 1876, 11d.; in 1886, 1s. 3d.; in 1896, 1s. 1d.; and in 1897, 1s. 2d. In the Westport Union the rate was at present 2s. 2d., and in the Achill Island 4s. 6d. A remarkable speech was delivered in Paris the other day by the British Ambassador on the improvement of the condition of the masses, and the decline of pauperism; and he stated that he could give figures to show the decline of pauperism. But he left out Ireland altogether, though he could have shown that in recent years pauperism had doubled in Ireland. This condition of things was not confined to County Mayo. It was also to be found in County Galway. He had a letter in his pocket from a gentleman describing the state of things in that county, in which he said that 20 per cent. of the people for three or four months in the year—except a famine year, which was their best year, because it brought them relief work—lived on food that neither God nor man nor Nature ever meant as food for human beings. Let the Chief Secretary or his right hon. and learned and lackadaisical Friend the Attorney General for Ireland go down to the Clifden Union and see for themselves the condition of things. They would find that in that Union and outside its borders, estates had been bought up by land jobbers. He would not appeal to the right hon. Gentleman in the craving manner of some of his hon. Friends. He would demand in the name of justice that justice should be done in these localities. Let the right hon. Gentleman send down inspectors who would tell the truth. For his part, he protested against the action of the inspectors who had been sent into Mayo. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. DENIS KILBRIDE (Galway, N.) said he could not agree with the remarks of his hon. Friend the Member for Galway City. In his speech he dealt not only with Conservative Ulster, but also with Nationalist Ulster. His hon. Friend drew no line of demarcation between the two. He maintained that the two counties of Antrim and Monaghan had done what they could to redeem the character of Ulster in connection with the Labourers' Cottages Act. The reason given by one of his hon. Friends why cottages were not required in the north-east of Ulster was that the agricultural labourers in that part of the province entirely resided in the houses of the farmers. He did not pretend to be as intimately acquainted with the conditions of agricultural social life in that part as his hon. Friend, but he would like to know whether all the labourers in north-east Ulster were unmarried men, and whether married men were boarded in the houses of the farmers? ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. PINKERTON explained that what he stated was that in North-east Ulster the labourers who required cottages got them from the farmers, and preferred to do so.

Mr. KILBRIDE said that if that was so, they must differ very much in disposition from the labourers in other parts of Ireland; because he understood that the reason for introducing the Act at all was, not so much to better house the agricultural classes as to give them a feeling of independence of the farmer. While they had saved the farmers from being the slaves of the landlords, they were equally anxious to emancipate the labourers from their dependence on the farmers. Another statement made by his hon. Friend he took the strongest exception to, and that was that boards of guardians had largely increased their expenditure by substituting trained nurses for pauper nurses. He spoke with some knowledge on this subject and he unhesitatingly said that although this alteration might, in the first instance, entail some expenditure, it ultimately caused very great saving in the rates, besides offering other great advantages. It was a notorious fact that before the introduction of trained nurses the sick poor were grossly neglected. There was another point to which he wished to call attention. The Chief Secretary had over and over again said, in reply to questions, that no exceptional distress exists in any portion of the west of Ireland.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I never said that. I am quite aware that there are parts of the west of Ireland where there is distress. But it is not beyond the average, and I said there was no reason why it should not be met by the usual means.

MR. KILBRIDE said that the right hon. Gentleman based his answers on the reports of the inspectors, and over and over again it had been pointed out to him that these inspectors who reported to him did not go to the best sources of information. He did not say by any means that the Chief Secretary would not be prepared by exceptional means to prevent deaths by starvation, or to prevent starvation in a modified form; but the right hon. Gentleman had no knowledge of these facts. He could only say that he had visited the districts once or twice, and on those occasions he was met with demonstrations of regard and respect. He thought from that that there was no distress in Westport, Belmullet, or Donegal. The reason he was met with demonstrations of welcome was that the people believed that he would be able to spend some English money which might stave off the evil days of starvation. When the right hon. Gentleman sent down an inspector he should direct him to go to the best sources from which he could find out the exact condition of the country. He would strongly suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should insist upon these inspectors going to the ministers of religion, all the ministers of religion, to inquire as to the condition of the people, and personally visit the houses of the labourers and of the farmers where they said the distress prevailed. Let the inspectors make themselves acquainted with the Listowel Union and other kindred districts, and see the almost absolute starvation in which the people lived. These people had an absolute horror of the workhouse. These poor districts were never worse than they were now. The prospect of the season was never worse than it was now. The prospects of the potato crop on the moorlands and reclaimed bogs had not been so bad for many years, and unless they had an exceptionally favourable harvest there was no chance of an average potato crop this year. The potatoes put down in the month of March were rotted, and the soil was sodden until after the first week in May. He would say to the Chief Secretary better be wise in time. They had been told by his hon. Friend the Member for North Kerry that the local rates were 13s. 6d. in the pound. If such a state of things existed in England they would have more than words of sympathy. With regard to this £40,000 which, under the Act of 1891, was allocated for the labourers, he thought that it was unfair that they should prevent or debar those unions in the south and west of Ireland who put the Labourers' Act into operation previous to 1891 from all benefit from the provisions of the Land Purchase Act of 1891. Those unions which had acted before that year were entitled to relief under the Act of 1891, but instead of that he found that this £40,000 was largely used for the purpose of stimulating unions in Ulster and some in the west of Ireland. He thought it was due to them that he should say one word in justice to the inspectors of the Local Government Board who conducted inquiries under the Labourers' Act. They acted fairly, justly, and sympathetically with the cause of the labourers, and endeavoured to facilitate the action of the Boards of Guardians, but he was sorry to say that when an appeal was taken by the local landlords, the Higher Court almost invariably overruled the inspectors. They claimed 43 cottages, and the Local Government Board passed 27. Appeals were taken against 24 of the cottages sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and the appeals were upheld. Thus, after long and expensive litigation, the Union had only three cottages passed. The Government gave no relief under their legislative proposals as they now stood to the Unions which had put the Act in operation, but they did give it to those Unions in the north of Ireland which had refused up to the present to apply the Act. Now no reply had been made to the point raised by the hon. Member for Leitrim in regard to the Mullingar Union. The medicine contract there was cancelled last year. The Local Government Board cancelled the contract on their own motion because the tender was the highest. This year tenders were again invited, and the tender of the gentleman whose tender turned out to be the highest was accepted by the Board of Guardians. [Mr. JOHNSTON: "He was a Nationalist!"] If he was a Nationalist he was not a fit person to be allowed by the Local Government Board to be the contractor this year. The fact that his tender was cancelled last year was *primâ facie* sufficient reason why he should not have the contract this year. He noticed under the heading "Travelling Expenses":—

> "Actual expenses of locomotion and £1 a night and 3s. 6d. per day of not less than seven hours, when absent from headquarters on duty, to each of three auditors."

He also found:—

> "Travelling expenses, etc., of auditors of Poor Law Unions, etc. Allowance of £100 a year to each of seven auditors, to cover travelling and subsistence."

He was glad to find that the Local Government Board were not alone believers in an eight hours' day, but that they recognised a seven hours' day. What, however, he wanted to point out was that it was an extravagant waste of money to allow a servant £1 each night he slept out. He had no doubt the seven men were eminently fitted for the posts they occupied, but £100 a year ought to be sufficient for their travelling expenses. He urged the Chief Secretary for Ireland to watch closely the state of things in the Union of Glenamaddy, in Galway. Apparently the number of indoor paupers did not increase very considerably in the year ending March 1, 1897, and there was no very large increase of outdoor relief. Nevertheless, the condition of the people was very precarious in consequence of the condition of the potato crop. The land in the Union was chiefly reclaimed bog land, and the people depended for their food upon the potatoes. That being the case, it was not reassuring to know that the next crop would probably be the worst since the year 1879, owing to conditions over which the people had no control. Up to May there had been an abnormal rainfall, and during the winter it was impossible to carry on the ordinary agricultural operations preparatory to the spring sowing. In the whole of the Union scarcely two acres of land could be cultivated during the winter, and it was not until the ordinary seed time that the people were able to get on with the preliminary preparation of the land. This had thrown the setting of the crop six months later than usual. Of course, the success of the potato crop in Ireland largely depended upon the time when the seed potatoes were put in, and if potatoes could not be planted until May 1, they would not mature and ripen before October 1. The effects of blight in such a year were greatly to be dreaded, and he hoped that the Chief Secretary would impress upon the Boards of Guardians the necessity of adopting measures to prevent the ruinous effect of blight upon the crop.

[The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS resumed the Chair.]

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.) said that he had heard of aboriginal tribes in South Australia who used to select champions to represent them. These champions alternately hit each other on the head, and subsequently a third party stepped in, and with a long spear stirred up both contending parties with perfect impartiality. He felt that he was intervening in this Debate in much the same spirit as that which influenced this third gentleman. With regard to the subject of labourers' cottages, to which reference had been made, he said that he admitted that in the greater part of the north-east of Ireland such cottages were by no means generally required. The reason was that in that part of the country a large portion of the population was employed in the linen industry, and now lived in the towns. The consequence was that there were sufficient cottages available at reasonable rents in the country, and it was therefore unnecessary to erect labourers' cottages at the expense of the Unions. He wished to support what had been said as to the importance of employing trained nurses in Unions. Many of the nurses employed in the past had been quite unsuited to the position.

Much additional cost need not be thrown upon the Unions by the employment of a few trained nurses. In his part of the country the workhouses were not, in the ordinary sense, institutions for the poor. They were infirmaries, and therefore it was of the greatest importance that they should be carried on on proper hospital principles. [" Hear, hear ! "]

MR. DILLON thought that no one would deny that there was great room for improvement in the Irish workhouses, and that there were many workhouses in which the treatment of the sick poor especially, and of the able-bodied paupers, was not of a kind to commend itself to any humane man. When he heard the charges made against the Poor Law Boards in Ireland, he felt it was exceedingly unjust to cast any portion of the blame on the Irish people, for the simple reason that at the present time they had no responsibility whatever for the condition of the Irish workhouses. The Irish Poor Law had been administered by the preponderating power of two interests—the *ex officio* guardians and the propertied class—and the Local Government Board. If the administration of the Poor Law left many things to be desired—and he admitted it did—those who were to blame were the Government, who, in the words of the remarkable speech of the First Lord of the Treasury that evening, had allowed, in spite of the protests of the Nationalist Members, an antiquated and outworn machinery to exist year after year. Without committing himself in any way to the details of the future policy of the Government, he rejoiced at the extraordinary and revolutionary change announced on behalf of the Government, who had frankly flung over two Bills which were based on a continuation and extension of the old, rotten, and utterly discredited system of governing Ireland by Castle Boards, and had declared that, for the first time so far as local government was concerned, they were practically going to trust the Irish people. [*Cheers*.] If the pledges of the First Lord were truly carried out—and they had been so often deceived, and pledges given in that House had been so often broken or indefinitely postponed that he must excuse them if they waited before they became enthusiastic over the new programme—then it would be really time to test what would be the local administration under the control of the people, who, for the first time, would have got a chance in this respect. He believed that if the principles laid down by the First Lord were carried out and honestly put into force, they would carry him a great deal further than he expected. He believed that when they set up an honest, democratic, and untammeled form of local government in Ireland, it would be impossible to maintain the present control by irresponsible and unnatural Castle Boards. [" Hear, hear ! "] The subject of the treatment of the sick poor in Irish workhouses had attracted a great deal of attention, and, while he gave the Chief Secretary full credit for humane desires, he believed the Government were well advised in dropping the Poor Law Relief Bill. It was a very complicated and, in some of its provisions, even a dangerous Bill, and there was an increasing amount of anxiety and alarm amongst some of the best-administered unions in Ireland in regard to its working. He believed the ultimate goal to be aimed at in local administration was to throw the greatest possible amount of responsibility on the people, and to give the greatest possible amount of liberty consistent with the maintenance of a central Government, to the localities. In proportion as they brought home responsibility to the people, he believed they would promote pure and economical administration. He believed the policy suggested in the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury was the only proper and effective remedy for all those evils which had grown up in connection with Poor Law administration in Ireland. He showed that the Debate had been conducted free from party spirit, and, though some Irish Members upheld the action of inspectors of the Local Government Board and others condemned it, the explanation of the diversity was to be found in the fact that in some districts excellent inspectors were to be found, while in other districts the inspectors were unsympathetic. As to the administration of the Labourers' Acts, he thought that with but few exceptions the inspectors had given satisfaction. The complaints of some of his hon. Friends as to distress in the west of Ireland were, however, well founded. The inspectors of the Local Government Board were officials of a Department which was not subject to the influence of Irish public opinion; they were responsible to an irresponsible Minister in the matter of local details. The poverty of the people in the west of Ireland was chronic, though at present it might not be widespread or on the verge of starvation. But in the Swinford Union, for example, the condition of affairs was alarming; poverty was increasing, and there was a prospect of starvation at an early date. The rates of the union were now standing at an enormously high figure, and he hoped that the Chief Secretary would keep a watch on these unions in the west of Ireland and examine the rates. He had a few words to say as to the Labourers' Acts. They had heard about the contrast between the Ulster unions and the Southern unions. Roughly speaking, the unions where the popular element was strongest were the unions which had used the Labourers' Acts most. It was untrue that it was the Irish farmers who had objected to the use of these Acts. There might be exceptions; but the rule was this, that where the popular element was in the ascendant and the farmers had the power, there they would find an enormous number of labourers' cottages. [An HON. MEMBER: "Not in Ulster!"] Perhaps not—that was a Unionist country. But wherever the Nationalist farmers were in the ascendant, there they would find that the Labourers' Acts had been generally put into operation, and wherever the landlords were in the ascendant there the Acts had been obstructed. It would be monstrous and most unjust to penalise and discourage unions which, as some of the Southern unions had done, had generously saddled themselves with heavy costs for putting up labourers' cottages which were a pleasure to look at. These cottages, which had been graphically described by the hon. Member for South Monaghan, had introduced an amount of civilisation which had been the astonishment of everybody who beheld it. These poor men, who had previously been living in the midst of poverty, filth, and degradation which had excited the horror and wonder of travellers from all parts of Europe, had been taken out of their mud-huts and put into these cottages; and what was the result? One might go into one of these habitations and find them the perfection of neatness and order. The people had immediately taken advantage of the new situation created for them; and he asserted that they came into honourable competition with any labourers in England—showing what capacity there was in the Irish peasantry for civilisation and for rising in the social scale if they were only given a fair field. [*Cheers.*] It would be monstrous, therefore, to in any way penalise and discourage those unions which had done so much for the Irish labourers. There had been a good deal of talk about Ulster unions not being in favour of labourers' cottages. An hon. Member had mentioned to him the case of the union of Portumna, a considerable part of which had the singular honour of belonging to the Marquess of Clanricarde. In that union, owing to the property vote and the number of *ex-officio* guardians, the propertied and the enlightened classes predominated. The result was that the labourers of Portumna, although in the south of Ireland, were still living in hovels. They went to the guardians and asked for a scheme of labourers' cottages; but the *ex-officios*, who would come from the end of the world if it was a question of electing a nurse or a workhouse clerk, remained away and left the Board without a quorum; and he believed that to this hour the labourers of that unfortunate union, owing to the obstruction of these gentlemen, were left without any assistance under the Act. There was one other point to which he wished to allude, a case in the Union of Strabane, where a poor man had been refused a cottage under the Labourers' Acts. He had forgotten the man's name, but the right hon. Gentleman answered his question on the subject two or three days ago. Three years ago this man, who was a man of considerable intelligence, and was living in a miserable hovel, applied for a labourer's cottage. A Local Government Board inspector was brought down from Dublin to inspect this hovel, and, according to the answer of the Chief Secretary, he condemned it as unfit for human habitation. What happened? The unfortunate man, after fighting his battle for three years, was refused a cottage, on the ground that he was not an "agricultural labourer." He had assured him (the speaker) that he held his cottage on the terms of giving a certain amount of labour as an agricultural labourer every year. But he was refused because, being an industrious and exceptionally intelligent man, he had taken a contract under one of the road contractors. For that, he was condemned to go on living in a wretched place, where his life was in danger, and which the Local Government Board inspector had condemned. He certainly thought that was a very unjust straining of the definition, and he hoped the Chief Secretary would write the Local Government Board advising them to adopt a more liberal interpretation. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said the hon. Member had referred to the case of a labourer who was refused a cottage on the ground that he was a road contractor. That was the information supplied to him. If he was a road contractor in so narrow and technical a sense as not properly to exclude him from the definition of an agricultural labourer, of course he regretted it, and he would do what he could to remedy it. He would call the attention of the Local Government Board to the case, and ask them for further particulars in regard to it. With regard to the question of distress in the west of Ireland, he had never at any time denied that distress, and even severe distress, had existed; only it did not appear to him that exceptional treatment, by which he meant relief works, was called for. Relief works in Ireland, as far as he knew, had never been adopted as a remedy except where the distress had been severe in special localities and also widespread; and although relief works had certain undeniable advantages, they had also very great disadvantages. They were tried on a considerable scale in 1890 and 1891, and although on those occasions they were successful in coping with the distress, yet they were so profitable to every class of the community where they were adopted, that in every year since then, where there was the smallest excuse, every class, whether landowners or shopkeepers or small farmers, had joined in representing to the Government that the actual state of things was much more serious than he believed it to have been. He had thought it necessary to set his face rigidly against the proposal for relief works. He believed if he had followed the example of the right hon. Member for Montrose in 1894, and had again applied to the Treasury for money for relief works, that the inhabitants of the poorer districts in the west of Ireland would have been gradually taught the lesson that they could not be expected to support themselves by their own efforts—a most disastrous lesson to teach them. While he did not deny that the rates in those districts were very heavy and that poverty was chronic in them, yet he thought it would have been on his part an unstatesmanlike act if he had done what would have been a ready and easy thing to do, namely, to go to the Treasury and say, "In order to keep these people alive, they require the assistance of public funds, and I am not prepared to be responsible for them unless that assistance is forthcoming." That was not the line which, in the interests of the districts concerned, he considered it was possible for him to adopt. As regarded heavy rates, after the announcement of his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury, he need not remind the Committee that considerable relief would in future years be given to those districts, but it would be most undesirable, except in cases of absolute necessity and wide-spread distress, that those districts should continually expect relief from the State. He appealed to the Committee now, after six hours' discussion, to allow the Vote to be taken.

MR. D. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) regretted exceedingly that the right hon. Gentleman had delivered the speech he had just made. It was only once a year that Irish Nationalist Members had the opportunity of discussing this Vote in the House of Commons, and he thought that when on behalf of the poverty-stricken districts they appealed at the bar of mercy, the House of Commons ought to listen to them. In the early part of the discussion on that Vote the hon. Member for West Cavan, who knew the west of Ireland better even than the Chief Secretary himself, or the First Lord of the Treasury, made the statement that in Belmullet and Killala the officials of the Local Government Board did not visit any of the houses. The Chief Secretary in reply said that statement was absolutely incorrect. On this point he would quote what was said by the Rev. Father Hewson. Speaking at a meeting at Belmullet on the 18th February, the reverend gentleman said:—

> "The Local Government thereupon sent their officer to investigate the condition of the people, with the view of reporting thereon. But how was this investigation made? He could speak only for his own parish, and he now asked publicly did those who were sent to make the investigation even visit a single homestead or farm within that parish? If passing along on an outside car, or riding on a bicycle meant investigation, then, indeed, they had made their investigation, and when it was suggested the investigation had not been made, then the relieving officer here was compelled to supply the information that ought to have been obtained by the parties sent down to make their investigation."

He had a letter from another gentleman whom the right hon. Gentleman knew, who wrote that he was surprised the inspector had reported that there was no distress, because such a report was in direct conflict with what the inspector had said in conversation. His correspondent added, "He saw the distress till he was sick of it."

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have repeatedly stated that I never said there was no distress.

MR. CRILLY said that the right hon. Gentleman had done the stereotyped work of the Chief Secretary in defending the officials of the Local Government Board. The right hon. Gentleman and his officials had failed to take due note of the distress in Belmullet and Killarney; they should have shown greater sympathy in the application of the Poor Law; but until the Bill which the Leader of the House had foreshadowed was passed, it was useless for Irishmen to expect justice from the House of Commons. They would allow the Vote to pass under protest and with the consciousness that it was the last time that Irish Members would have to protest against the conduct of these alien boards in Ireland.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) complained that the Estimate showed, not a substantial increase, but a substantial decrease in the salaries and expenses of the Irish dispensary doctors, a body of men whose devotion to duty, and whose service to suffering humanity, were beyond all praise. They had to travel long distances, and at night frequently, and yet their demand for horse money was persistently ignored by the Local Government Board. He noticed that year after year the same amount appeared in the Estimates for the supply of vaccine lymph to the dispensaries. He would like to know what became of the lymph. The doctors for whose use it was intended knew nothing about it, for they never used it. Why was it that every year they spent the same money? They were told that everything was quiet and tranquil, and still they found that they had an increase of £2,158 upon this expenditure in connection with the Local Government Board. Where did all this braying of trumpets come in? [*Laughter.*] The right hon. Gentleman was the master of this Board, and he ought to be master of the subject. [*Laughter.*] He hoped to obtain a satisfactory assurance from the Chief Secretary upon these points.

Vote agreed to.

CLASS III.

Motion made, and Question proposed:—

> "That a sum, not exceeding £40,229, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for criminal prosecutions and other law charges in Ireland."

MR. DILLON wished to call attention to the trial of the brothers Maguire in the North of Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said the trial was pending, and the case could not be gone into without prejudice to the accused.

MR. DILLON said he did not desire to go into the evidence, and would confine himself to the action of the Attorney General in reference to the case.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said it was unusual to discuss a case pending before the Courts. Still, he could not hold that it was out of order. On the other hand, as far as he had been able to discover, the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker on former occasions had always laid down that it was unusual and undesirable, in the interest of the prisoners, to discuss a case which was pending.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR suggested the desirability of postponing the Vote. The Attorney General could not defend his action in this case without going into the evidence.

MR. DILLON said he proposed to confine himself to the grounds on which he brought up the case. These unfortunate men had been 14 months in gaol, having been tried three times on different charges and acquitted, and they were now in prison merely on a charge of larceny. Even if they were guilty, the punishment they had already undergone would be severe enough. Bail had been applied for, and hitherto refused.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND said the hon. Member was singularly inaccurate in his facts. These men were arrested on March 6, 1896. They were then tried on the charge of murder, and the jury disagreed. They were tried again at the Assizes at Belfast and acquitted. They were then charged with robbery from the person of the man they were alleged to have murdered. The learned Judge who presided at the trial refused an application for bail. They had never made application for bail to the Court of Queen's Bench, which they were entitled to do, and it was impossible for him to give the reason which made it imperative upon him, if they made that application to the Court, to advise it without going into the evidence against them.

MR. DILLON said these unfortunate men had been subjected to three trials by packed juries—[*Nationalist cheers*]—and acquitted by a Belfast jury of the charge of murder. They were taken to Belfast from their own homes, and put to enormous expense, and were still in gaol unconvicted, merely on a charge of larceny. They were now invited to go to the Queen's Bench and apply for bail, well knowing that the Attorney General would oppose the application, and it would be refused. There was no criminal matter which in his time had created so much interest in the North of Ireland as this case. He would agree to the postponement of the Vote, hoping that the Chief Secretary would look carefully into the case.

MR. FLYNN said he desired now to give notice—lest he should be accused of giving short notice hereafter—that he should raise in as full a manner as possible the question of jury packing at the last Winter Assizes at Cork.

*MR. R. M. DANE (Fermanagh, N.) said that before the House agreed to the postponement of the Vote, he wished to say that he hoped the Attorney General for Ireland would not allow anything that had taken place on the part of the hon. Member for East Mayo that night to lead him to allow these men to escape being tried again. The feeling in the case was not confined to one party. It was quite true that these men were tried for what looked very like murder.

An hon. Member: They were acquitted of that.

*Mr. DANE: And it was equally true that the case was made a party one—[*Nationalist cheers*]—by the friends of the hon. Member for East Mayo.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: As we have withdrawn the Vote, it is hardly right that the discussion should go on.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Class II.

2. £1,243, to complete the sum for Charitable Donations and Bequests Office, Ireland.—Agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £3,880, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Public Record Office in Ireland, and of the Keeper of State Papers in Dublin."

Mr. FLYNN said he wished to know whether any steps had been taken in latter years with regard to the publication of State papers and public documents? There had been an interruption in the issue of State papers which were of direct importance to Ireland. They had no papers dealing with Ireland for a long time, and it was natural that they should be very keen and on the alert. They could not get hold of these State papers unless they watched.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS said this was a matter which should be dealt with on the Vote of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. They were responsible for the issue of documents.

Dr. TANNER said that that Commission dealt with England and Wales as well as Ireland, but somehow the documents were not allowed to circulate outside a certain set. Only high and dry particulars had been furnished to them during the last Session of Parliament. He could make neither head nor tail of a return from the Record Office. He could only say now what he had heard his hon. Friend Mr. Sexton, who was then Member for West Belfast, say in connection with a similar return, that it was "bald, miserable, and discreditable." Could something not be done to make these returns interesting instead of bald returns? As to the Record Office in Ireland, that meant Dublin, for practically all the work was done in Dublin, and it was circulated for the benefit of certain persons. There was always in connection with certain officials an increase of "salaries, wages, and allowances." In connection with this small office they had an increase of £314, whereas in other years they had a falling off. It had increased since the Chief Secretary was there. The increase was not in connection with smaller affairs, but in connection with the greater men.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the Vote. At present he is not doing so.

Dr. TANNER said if the increase in salaries was given to the poorer men, he should not object so much, but the increase was given to men who really did not want it, instead of to the poor men who did require it. For incidental expenses nothing could be said. [*Laughter.*] Instead of laughing, he hoped hon. Gentlemen would join him and others in keeping down expenditure. In any case, when expenditure was incurred he thought it should go rather to the poor than to the rich.

Mr. P. A. M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.) trusted they would receive from the Chief Secretary, or some other responsible Minister, an explanation of the services on which this money was spent, otherwise it would be the duty of Irish Members to resist the Vote, or to move its reduction.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said that hitherto the Vote had never been the subject of discussion, it had always been regarded as a matter of course. Details were given on page 193 of the Estimates. The greater part of the increased expenditure arose from the automatic increase in the salaries of eight clerks employed in the Department.

Mr. FLYNN hoped that it would be shown what value was received for the expenditure.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I will give further details on Report.

Mr. KILBRIDE said he found they were asked to vote the salaries of six workmen who were described as searchers. What the men had to do as searchers he was at a loss to understand. The men received £1 a week each. What could they have to do as searchers in a Record Office?

And, it being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue.—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

Mr P A. M'Hugh.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 15th June.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 31st May.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 16th June.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

House Adjourned at Five Minutes after Twelve o'Clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 24th May 1897.

ROYAL NIGER COMPANY.

Lord STANMORE rose to ask a question of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs with respect to the future government of the territories of the Royal Niger Company. He said that their Lordships would remember that in the earlier part of the present year the Royal Niger Company by a series of Measures admirably planned and as admirably executed, assumed a more direct control than it had previously exercised over extensive regions to the south and west of the Niger, which, although within its sphere of influence, had until then remained in a position of practical independence. By so doing the Company had largely increased its responsibilities, and it had become a question whether some modification of its mode of government might not be requisite in consequence. He had nothing to say against the Company's system of administration or its working—quite the reverse. He believed that in regions such as those in question a government like that of the Royal Niger Company was the best now and for a long time to come. It was a cheap form of government, but that was by no means its only or even its chief advantage. It could deal both with men and with measures in a more rough-and-ready way than a public department fettered by inelastic rules. Its servants, having only their own superiors to look to, and having their field of action confined to the region in which they served, were far more likely to identify themselves with its interests and those of its population than men belonging to a more widely-extended service, who naturally looked on employment in an unhealthy and uncivilised region chiefly as a means of escape through promotion to a more healthy and agreeable post. The attention of the directors being devoted exclusively to their own affairs, there was no danger of that sort of paralysis which arose from the necessity under which an overworked and overburdened department sometimes found itself of postponing the consideration of matters in themselves important till others more important or more pressing had been dealt with. But, on the other hand, the exclusive attention to its own affairs and interests which enabled a company to conduct its business successfully, might also lead to its not considering questions adequately from an Imperial point of view. The recent enlargement of the Niger Company's administrative area brought it into contact with the spheres of influence of other nations not less susceptible than ourselves. When such contact existed, occasions for friction must arise; and when they did, men who regarded above all things the maintenance of the rights and position of the local authorities would be not unlikely to act in a different manner from men with whom the importance of maintaining good relations between ourselves and other European States was a primary consideration. Much emphasis was given to this point by the telegrams which appeared in the newspapers last week, and in which it was asserted that French officers had forced themselves against his will upon the King of Boussa on the Niger, and that he had appealed against them to the company, which maintained, he believed rightly, that Boussa was one of the vassal States within its sphere of influence. Here were the elements of a very pretty quarrel, and it was evident that much might depend upon the tact and forbearance of the local officials and the instructions they received from their directors at home. He would ask, therefore, whether, in view of the altered situation produced by recent events, and the greatly increased responsibility of the Company, Her Majesty's Government contemplated the assumption of any greater degree of supervision over or participation in the executive administration of the Niger Company than they at present possessed, either by the addition to the board of directors of members nominated by the Crown or by any other means. Before sitting down he wished to repeat that he had no charge to bring against the Company. He believed the principles of its administration to be sound and its action to be judicious, humane, and just; but he thought that when questions of interest to other States as well as to ourselves were likely to arise, it was desirable that there should be greater security than existed at present that those questions would not be dealt with from an exclusively local standpoint.

*THE PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of SALISBURY): I am bound to follow the example of my noble Friend, and in dealing with this question carefully to guard myself from any appearance of censure against the Company or against those by whom the Company's affairs are directed. On the contrary, I think it is impossible to mention the names of the founders of the Company, of the late Lord Aberdare, for example, and especially of Sir George Goldie, without recognising the very high administrative ability which they have shown, and their great enterprise and resource, which place them high on the lists of the pioneers of English civilisation in the dark places of the earth. ["Hear, hear!"] I think they deserve the very highest praise. But because I freely render that tribute, I am not on that account bound to admit that the system which they are working is, in existing circumstances, and as matters have developed, in all respects the most expedient that could be devised. I do not wish to enter far upon a question which is occupying the anxious attention of Her Majesty's Government, and with regard to which I cannot say that definite conclusions have been arrived at. But I do not see any probability of an issue from our difficulties by adopting the change of constitution which is suggested by my noble Friend. He suggests that we should secure a more complete control over the action of the company by having Government directors upon its Board. I speak from memory, but my impression is that this country has never adopted that mode of government, has never acquired that control without giving something in the nature of a guarantee of profits to the company over which the control was exercised. There is the old instance of the East India Company. When this country assumed the entire direction of the affairs of that company, it guaranteed it a dividend of 10 per cent. Again, there are the railways in India, where a Government director is a Chairman of the Board. In all those cases there are Government guarantees of the dividends of the shareholders, and it is only reasonable that it should be so, because, of course, the first object of the directors of a company is and ought to be to secure a proper, fair, and legitimate return for their investments to the shareholders who have placed them in power. But the object of a Government must very often be very different, and the course which they may take may not be that which will secure the highest dividends to the shareholders. It does not seem, therefore, to be fair to take the management of a company out of the hands of the shareholders unless you are prepared to indemnify them against any pecuniary injury that may result. At the same time, I am not prepared to say that the present state of things on the Niger corresponds entirely to the necessities of our time. My noble Friend is quite right when he says that the progress of the Niger Company has brought them into close contact with territories or spheres of influence claimed by other nations, and the thought does arise that, however patriotic the Company may be, it is not to be supposed that they are utterly uninfluenced by considerations of the commercial duties which are imposed upon them by the position which they occupy. On the other hand, the diplomatic questions raised by their neighbourhood to other territories are often of a very difficult and delicate character, and it is impossible not to feel that a more direct influence on the part of Her Majesty's Government would be desirable if it could be obtained. There are two sets of difficulties. There are the difficulties with native races, whose rights we are accused of having dealt with too cheaply, as in respect to the persons who are called the men of the town of Brass, who complained that their markets are entirely destroyed by the regulations and interposition of the Niger Company; and then there is that much more difficult and delicate set of questions to which my noble Friend alluded, which arise out of the fact that the rights to territory are not sufficiently defined to exclude the possibility of contest, and that matters may even come to such a point as they have done in the case to which he referred, the case of Broussa, where a French force has marched in and taken a territory which the Niger Company imagined to be their own. The matter, of course, is not one which I can speak of in detail, because it is the subject of diplomatic communication; but the fact that the controversy should have arisen, on whichever side the right lay, shows the difficulties which are pressing upon us in consequence, in part, of the present organisation of the Queen's influence and dominion in that part of Africa. I have only, therefore, to answer in the negative my noble Friend's suggestion, and to say that we do not think it probable that the difficulties, whatever they are, can be adjusted by putting Government directors on the Board. I recognise that there are many difficulties attaching to the present state of things, and I can assure my noble Friend that they are occupying our most anxious attention. I do not think I should be justified in going further into that at the present moment, and I will only conclude by again reiterating that in any observations I have made I do not wish to imply the slightest blame for the conduct of the directors of the Niger Company, for whose qualities and administrative and military success I, in conjunction with all who are acquainted with the circumstances, entertain the most unfeigned admiration. [*Cheers.*]

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I wish to say a word or two on this subject, as it fell to my lot to deal with questions connected with the Niger Company of some importance at the time when I held the seals of the Foreign Office. I entirely concur in what the noble Marquess said at the beginning of his remarks, and repeated at the end, as to the success of the Niger Company, and the singular ability they have shown in administering the territories under their care. My experience was quite sufficient to show me, as it has shown the noble Marquess, that there are very serious difficulties connected with the position of the Company there which require the earnest attention of Her Majesty's Government. These difficulties are, above all, difficulties with foreign nations who have territories and spheres of influence adjoining. It will be perfectly obvious that other nations have a right to look to the Government of this country for redress in any grievance of which they may have to complain, and that any supposed aggression on their part or violation of our rights is a matter which involves the Government of the country in, it may be, serious discussions with other Governments. It always appeared to me that it is not altogether safe when questions of this kind may arise where the Government have not a clearly-defined position—although they have abundant powers, no doubt, under the charter—to enable them to ward off by timely action difficulties which might lead to complications of a serious character. I have no desire to refer further to this question; the difficulties will be present to the minds of everyone who knows the condition of affairs in that part of the world. I only wish to add that it gives me great satisfaction to hear that the attention of the Government is seriously directed to these matters with a view to introducing a remedy. I agree with the noble Marquess that the placing of Government directors on the Board would be by no means a sufficient remedy.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order): Reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be Read 3^a To-morrow.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to Order); Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (The Marquess of Lansdowne), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said that the Bill had been prepared for the purpose of removing a doubt which had arisen with regard to the effect of Rules issued under the Volunteer Act of 1863. The particular case which the Government had in view was that of a

Volunteer who, on joining his corps, undertook to make himself efficient within a particular period of time. On undertaking that engagement, he received a uniform free of expense from his corps, the corps expecting to be recouped from the capitation which the man would earn. It might happen that after having been equipped in this way the man might decline to fulfil his engagement and make himself efficient. Thereupon the corps lost the amount of capitation grant which the Volunteer would earn, and the funds of the corps were consequently mulcted, unless the sum could be recovered from the defaulting Volunteer by means of a fine. It was always believed that these fines could be recovered under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, but a recent decision of the Courts had thrown a doubt on that, and the Government desired to remove it. The matter was of some importance, because if these fines were only civil debts, and could only be recovered in the same way as civil debts, the colonel of the corps was deprived of the only efficient weapon which he possessed for securing that the men under his command should duly make themselves efficient. The Measure was, he believed, desired by the Volunteers themselves, and it had passed with but little or no comment through the other House of Parliament.

LORD MONKSWELL said he did not object to the principle of the Bill, which was probably a necessary and useful Measure. But he desired to call attention to the very mysterious drafting of Clause 2, which said: "If before the expiration of the term of such imprisonment." There was not a single word about imprisonment in the first clause. He had referred to the sections of the Act given in the margin, the meaning of which this Bill declared; and he could find nothing about "imprisonment" in either of the sections. No doubt there was a reference to the power of imprisonment in one of the sections in another part of the Act; and he imagined that reference was being made to the expiration of the term of any imprisonment for non-payment of the fine under the Act of 1863. He should be glad to know whether this was so.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE said that the criticism of the noble Lord was a just one. The second clause formed no part of the Bill when it was introduced. [*Laughter.*] It was accepted in the other House on the Motion of a private Member, but it was evident that the wording of the clause as it now stood would require alteration. He would have the matter put right before the next stage of the Bill was taken.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Manday next.

GRIFFITH'S VALUATION.

*VISCOUNT CLIFDEN: I wish to make an explanation, or rather an apology, to Her Majesty's Government. It may be in the recollection of some of your Lordships that I asked for a Paper to be printed a few days ago, which was refused to me on the score that it was too old—"antiquated" was, I think, the word I read somewhere attributed to the Government. But somebody has been kind enough to send me this Paper, printed as a Parliamentary Paper—[*laughter*]—in the year 1882, which, I need not remind your Lordships, was the year in which that infamous Act called the Land Act of 1881 came into operation; and, perhaps, noble Lords will be interested to know that the Paper was printed at the suggestion of the late Mr. W. H. Smith. I do not accuse the noble Lord who replied on behalf of the Government of knowing anything about this, but I think the Irish Office might have known something of this Paper, and then the noble Lord would not have given such an answer as was given to me the other night. Noble Lords on my side of the water, at all events, will be glad to know that this Paper is published. There are 74 pages of Griffith's instructions, and three of the Land Commissioners.

House Adjourned at Five o'Clock, till To-morrow, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LIVERPOOL CITY CHURCHES BILL [H.L.].

Order for Second Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months." He said that he thought it would have been more convenient had the hon. Member in charge of it explained its provisions. The Measure was rejected in 1893, and they ought to know what were the special new circumstances which had induced him to move it a second time. The Bill dealt with ten churches known as the Liverpool Corporation Churches and two parish churches. It was proposed to extinguish the liability of the Liverpool Corporation for the payment to them of certain annual grants which they had to pay under a section of an Act of Parliament. The sum contributed to the ten churches was £2,600 or thereabouts, and it was proposed by the Bill to commute that annual payment with a capital sum of £95,000. In regard to the two parish churches, St. Peter's and St. Nicholas's, the liability amounted to about £1,800. That amount it was proposed to commute by the payment of a capital sum of £48,000. The first ground on which he moved the rejection of the Bill was that the amount of commutation was put at much too high a figure. There was to be handed over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to be invested for the future endowment of the churches, and of new churches, over £101,000; and there was to be handed over a further sum of £13,406 to Queen Anne's Bounty, and £27,694 went to a building fund. It was not necessary to criticise the financial provisions beyond repeating that the amount of commutation was absurdly high. It represented 36 years' purchase, or nearly three times the amount of purchase in the Irish Church Act—fourteen years. Besides, the money was to come out of the pockets of the Liverpool ratepayers for the benefit of one section of the ratepayers. In the second place, it must be remembered that this rate was all the higher when they considered the fact that not only was this money to be paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, but the sites of the churches were also to be handed over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. That was all the more striking when it was remembered that in most cases the fabrics had been provided out of the pockets of the ratepayers. Were there any special reasons why this high rate of compensation should be paid? Had there been any unusual sacrifices on the part of the supporters of those churches, or had the churches been unusually successful in the past? The answer he believed to both questions was in the negative. Not only had the Corporation of Liverpool paid this annual grant amounting in the aggregate to something like £250,000, but they had also spent £117,000 on the building of the churches, so that after allowing for what had been received from pew rents, the Corporation had expended on these churches £300,000, and in spite of this the Church Party asked for 36½ years purchase. During the Debate in 1893 it was admitted on both sides of the House that there had been many scandals in connection with the relations between the Corporation and these churches under the arrangements in the past. He did not deny that at the outset those who initiated the idea of contributing from the ratepayers' funds towards those churches was a good one. But in this case, as in others, the arrangement had become an instrument by which the Corporation of Liverpool made permanent places and salaries for their friends and relatives. That was a fact admitted on all hands. The time he thought had come when this arrangement ought to come to an end. The only point on which he joined issue was as to the condition and terms upon which this arrangement ought to be terminated. He asked the House were the terms proposed just or equitable? There was no doubt that these churches had been a miserable failure in the past. That was admitted in the Debate a few years ago. The churches were large and poorly attended, and in parts of Liverpool where large congregations could not naturally be looked for. In the census taken in 1893 it was found that at St. George's, capable of seating 2,000, only 76 attended; in St. Paul's, capable of seating 1,800, only 16 attended; and in St. David's, the attendance was only 131. It seemed to him the history of the transactions between the Corporation and the parish churches, and their present position, was a factor which the House ought to have regard to in fixing the compensation to be paid, and the rate of the compensation. He knew very well that it would be said that it was proposed in the Bill to pull down two of the churches—St. George's and St. John's—to move them to another part of Liverpool, and to vest the old sites in the Corporation; but it was not very much comfort to the ratepayers to be presented with two sites which they years ago gave to the churches in question. He quite favoured the policy of removing these churches, but surely it ought to be arranged that the value of the sites and the fabrics given by the ratepayers should be taken into consideration. He did not deny that under the local Act of 1838, which was the foundation for the present Bill, the compromise suggested in these days of £105,000 invested for the benefit of these churches by the Corporation would have been a very good arrangement for the Corporation from a money standpoint; but those who had read the history of these days could not but see very clearly that there were two parties and two opposite opinions held in Liverpool on the question. That difference of opinion had always existed. In 1893 a similar Bill was before the House, but it was successfully opposed by an hon. Member whom he did not see present. In the opinion of that House, at any rate, the conditions were not equitable. In 1894 another Bill was introduced by seven Members of the House, two of whom represented Liverpool, the five others being closely connected with it, and according to it the commutation was not to be 36½ years' purchase but one year's only. He was aware that the Corporation of Liverpool last June passed by a great majority a Resolution in favour of the present Bill, but he held that was not to be taken as in any way an evidence of the real feeling of the ratepayers. The question had not been raised before the electors, and if the ratepayers knew what the Bill really provided and the details of the expenditure, which were its essential part, they would not be in its favour. The religious opinion of the people of Liverpool had largely changed since 1838. At that time it might be said that the prevailing religious opinion of Liverpool was that of the Episcopal Church, but he was given to believe that were a survey now taken, Liverpool opinion would be found divided into three more or less equal parts—Church people, Roman Catholics, and Dissenters. Evidence that was fair and equitable years ago could not be so to-day. With reference to the Church of St. David's, it was built by the Corporation, and was largely maintained by them. The congregation in 1893 was 131. Let them compare that with the fact that, relying entirely upon voluntary effort, the Welsh Nonconformists of Liverpool had during the same period built not one but forty churches; that they had a membership of 14,000, and that they contributed for their churches every year a sum approaching £20,000. It seemed to him that no good results would follow the passing of this Bill, and he moved the rejection in the interests of the ratepayers, because he thought the proposed arrangement was an unfair one, and because he thought that when property was given by the Corporation for a special religious purpose, and when that special purpose proved to be futile, the property being used for other purposes than it was designed for, it should be handed back to those who gave it. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield), in seconding the Amendment, said they were not dealing with tithes and glebe lands. The "pious ancestor" in this case was the old, unreformed, and corrupt Corporation of Liverpool. The history of these Liverpool churches was a history of unjust and profligate expenditure, of legal squabbling, and of ecclesiastical trickery. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Churchmen in those days treated the Corporation as a milch cow, going to it for whatever they wanted. Whether it was a new church or an additonal minister, they got what they asked for, and then the sanction of Parliament was obtained. It might be asked what was the use of reviving such unsavoury reflections, but they had an important bearing on the present Bill, seeing that the unjust charges then imposed on the Protestant Nonconformists and the Roman Catholics of Liverpool were imposed now. This Bill was a practical admission that the existing system was indefensible. But what was the proposed remedy? The promoters were willing that these unjust exactions should cease, but demanded the exorbitant sum of £143,000 by way of ransom. It was said of the sites in 1893 that they did not cost the Corporation a penny, but neither did they cost the Church a penny. They were public property, and the public ought not to be compelled to purchase them back. It would be said that the Bill involved details which could be discussed only in a Committee. But the principle on which it was based was unjust and unsound. When compulsory Church rates were abolished no compensation was given, and no provision was made for commutation. They were retained only where where money had been borrowed upon them, or where they existed in lieu of tithes. But these Liverpool payments did not come within their category. They ought, in fact, to have been dealt with in the Church Rate Act. There was also a local precedent which could be quoted, for when the Church of St. Catherine at Liverpool was pulled down the Corporation paid nothing, except for the protection of life interests, and that was all that was wanted in the case of the other churches. The present officials should be dealt with justly, and even generously, and perhaps the patrons should also be compensated, though some of them were only trustees. This injustice had been inflicted long enough, and should now come to an end. A more flagrantly unjust Bill than this had never been submitted to Parliament, and he hoped that it would be rejected, and that the promoters would be under the necessity of coming with a moderate and just scheme. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercrombie) said he begged to recommend the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House. The speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down did not, he thought, require any special notice from himself, first, because the Bill was essentially a Private Local Bill, and, secondly, because the hon. Gentleman's speech was one they had heard many a time all over England against the Establishment. [*Cheers.*] His Friend the hon. Member for Denbigh, who moved the rejection of the Bill, had every ground to object to it, both as a ratepayer and as an inhabitant of Liverpool. Being, as he was, well acquainted with the condition of things in Liverpool, he was surprised that the hon. Member should have found fault with their action in bringing this Bill again before the notice of the House of Commons. The fact was that in 1893 a Bill almost identical with this was promoted by all the local authorities, the Corporation, the parish, and the Bishop of Liverpool. It came before that House, but was thrown out by a chance majority of not more than nine votes in a House of not more than 380 Members. Inasmuch as the feeling of the locality was so much in its favour, was it any wonder that a few years afterwards the local authorities should have again promoted this Bill, and ask this present House of Commons to give it a more favourable consideration than the House which expired without any great sorrow on the part of those on his side gave it in the year 1893? The interesting fact about the Bill as now presented and the Bill which was formerly introduced was that the present Bill was promoted by a different Corporation from that which promoted the Bill of 1893. In 1893 there was an unextended Borough, and that restricted body voted in its favour. Since then the area of the city had been largely extended, and again the question had come up, and by an enhanced and appreciable majority had been approved. So recently as this year the new Bill came before the Corporation, and by 63 or 64 to 16 they desired that it might go forward. The House might, therefore, rely upon it that the Corporation represented strong local feeling. As a matter of fact, this matter had been thoroughly well discussed up and down Liverpool for many a long year. It might be anomalous, according to the present notion, that a corporation should endow churches, but as a matter of fact, the Corporation of Liverpool since 1698 up to a comparatively recent period, having regard to the great interests committed to them, had advanced money to build, endow, and repair churches. Unless the Bill passed, a very serious legal obligation with regard to the repair of the worn-out Church of St. Martin's would fall upon the shoulders of the Corporation. He submitted to the House that the business people of Liverpool could not have sanctioned such terms as those which had been arrived at had they thought them unfair or unjust. The names of the gentlemen on the local Committee, indeed, furnished a guarantee that the terms were most reasonable. Consequently the House might be sure that when the Committee upstairs had looked over the items there would be no question as to whether the Corporation were paying too much to get out of a clearly legal obligation. The hon. Member had endeavoured to point out that some of the sites formerly belonged to the Corporation, and were now practically being given over to the Church, but as a matter of fact, one of the most important sites which was going to be recovered by the Corporation was only given to the Corporation by the Duchy of Lancaster on condition that they built a church. £95,000 was a very moderate figure for the Corporation to pay for the advantages to be obtained, and the Corporation could borrow on such terms that he believed the saving to them would be equivalent to £400 a year. He thought he had shown that there was a strong local feeling in favour of the Bill, that every local authority had declared in its favour, and that the Bill had not been rushed on the House or on the locality. It had been in preparation five or ten years, and, therefore, there was no surprise, and the terms had been obviously most carefully thought out by the best business heads in Liverpool. He considered the House might fairly give the Bill the Second Reading, inasmuch as it was only thrown out by a small majority of nine when before under the consideration of the House. He was pleased to tell the House that the Bill in 1893 had received the *imprimatur* in the Division Lobby of the Member for Leeds (Mr. Herbert Gladstone).

*MR. MELLOR (York, W. R., Sowerby) said the House had heard three excellent speeches on the subject of the Bill, but they had all dealt with its details; he thought the details of a complicated matter of this description could only be properly examined by a Committee. What they really wanted in this case was the Report of a Select Committee on the Bill. He was of opinion, considering the nature of the Bill, that it would be unfair, indeed, impossible, to ask the House to deal with it now in a satisfactory way, and, therefore, he hoped it would, in the usual manner, be relegated to a Committee. It seemed to him in all these cases difficult to ask the House, at the time of Private Business to reject a Bill of this character on the Motion for its Second Reading. Such Bills as these were generally full of details, and contained local and personal matters, and he had always been of opinion that the House was better able to come to a proper conclusion when such Bills had been examined in the ordinary way. For nearly 200 years, he gathered the Corporation of Liverpool and the parish of Liverpool had had to raise and pay out of the rates an annual sum to pay for the maintenance of these churches, for the salaries of the clergy and of the officers connected with the churches. He did not hesitate to say that such a tax was an odious tax, and he did not think any Member of the House, whether Churchman or Nonconformist, Tory or Liberal, could come to any other conclusion. Well, in regard to the matter, there were only two things to be done. They must either pay the tax or commute the tax. ["Hear, hear!"] The great majority of the ratepayers had agreed to the commutation. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Corporation, and the parish of Liverpool had agreed to it. They had agreed to this bargain, and was the House, upon the mere suggestion that the amount agreed upon was too large, to reject such a bargain? The whole question was whether the terms were right, and such as the House could affirm. He hoped the House would allow the Bill to go to the Committee, who would examine it and make such a Report that the House would be able to deal with it satisfactorily on the Second Reading.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby) said he was sure the House would do well to follow the admirable advice given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Sowerby Division of Yorkshire (Mr. Mellor). He wished to express, on behalf of the

Corporation of Liverpool, an entire repudiation of the statement that in the terms they had consented to give in regard to this matter, they had been actuated in any other way than in the direct interests of the ratepayers they represented. He ventured to say that there was no city in which it would be more improper to say that they did not represent their constituents than the Corporation of Liverpool — ["hear, hear!"]—for in regard to this, Liverpool had been recently tested in more ways than one. The Liverpool Corporation believed there were certain existing sums which they owed in reference to these churches, and they were anxious not to repudiate their obligations. The hon. Gentlemen who moved and seconded the rejection of the Bill recommended that those obligations should be repudiated. Liverpool took no such view, and they were prepared in return for what they believed would be a substantial advantage to the city, to come to the fair terms given by the Bill. The terms were well-known in Liverpool, had been approved by all the authorities there, as well as by the residents. Those terms had been very seriously examined, and he sincerely hoped the House would not follow the example of the last House of Commons, but would give the Bill the Second Reading, in order that the straightforward course might be taken of examination by Committee. There was no question of principle involved; the terms could not be examined in that Chamber. Liverpool asked the House to allow them to deal with this matter, which was of great importance to them, whether regarded from the point of view of the Corporation, residents, or ratepayers. The attitude of those who wished to reject the Bill only proceeded from a very small minority of the people of the city of Liverpool. ["Hear, hear!"]

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 95.—(Division List, No. 213.)

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read a Second time.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House and two by the Committee of Selection. That all Petitions aganst the Bill presented five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents, be heard against the Bill, and counsel heard in support of the Bill. That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records. That three be the quorum."

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE said he did not see any reason why this Bill should be treated differently from any other Bill, and, therefore, he should oppose the present Motion. ["Hear, hear!"]

The House divided:—Ayes, 117; Noes, 199.—(Division List, No. 214.)

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS)—[EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expenses of and relating to arbitration which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to amend the law with respect to Compensation to Workmen for Accidental Injuries suffered in the course of their employment, and of an compensation that may become payable in respect of Accidents to Workmen employed by or under the Crown in pursuance of such Act (Queen's Recommendation signified), To-morrow. —(*Sir Matthew White Ridley.*)

QUESTIONS.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the fact that the establishment of the Volunteer Force on its present basis as a permanent national institution of unpaid soldiery has been one of the principal events of the Queen's reign, Her Majesty proposes, on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee, and during the visit of the Nation's guests, to hold a review of the force in London or elsewhere?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford: It will not, I fear, be possible to include a review of the Volunteer Force among the arrangements to be made in celebration of the Diamond Jubilee during the next few weeks, but the force will be largely represented on the occasion of the ceremony of the 22nd.

MR. HARRY FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any arrangement will be made for enabling the Foreign Consular Corps in London to attend the approaching Diamond Jubilee celebration or to take part in the Royal Procession?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): The arrangements in connection with the celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee do not rest with the Foreign Office. We have not heard that it is in contemplation to make any provision for the attendance or participation of the Foreign Consular Body.

SIR CHARLES DALRYMPLE (Ipswich): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether any arrangement will be made for enabling the High Sheriffs of counties of England to witness the Jubilee Procession, seeing that in 1887 the position which they hold was recognised by their having places assigned to them in Westminster Abbey?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I regret that I do not see my way to allot to the High Sheriffs tickets for the stands which are being erected for the Government Departments to view the Queen's Procession.

PRISON SYSTEM (SCOTLAND).

MR. T. C. H. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether under the present prison system of Scotland imbecile or weak-minded prisoners are associated in cells with other criminals without the personal supervision either of officers or hired attendants, whose duty it should be to see that such prisoners are not maltreated; whether sick prisoners are left to the care of fellow criminals who are wholly without experience in the treatment of invalids; whether evidence showing that these practices prevailed was given in November last by a number of medical men holding appointments in connection with prisons in Scotland; and whether, in view of the fact that such practices have been condemned by Commissioners of Prisons and abolished both in England and Ireland, he will undertake at an early date to endeavour to assimilate the prison system of Scotland in these particulars to the more humane modes of treatment obtaining in England and Ireland?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Prison Commissioners for Scotland that when weak-minded prisoners are associated on medical grounds they are under the close inspection of prison officers who are responsible that no prisoner is maltreated, but that all are properly cared for, and by the rules the medical officer has to satisfy himself that the arrangements are effective; that sick prisoners are not left to the care of fellow criminals; and that no record can be found of any evidence given by prison medical officers in November last regarding the care of the sick. The Prison Commissioners are satisfied that the treatment of the sick prisoners is humane, and they have always directed their special attention to this part of prison administration.

SCHOOL BOARD DIVISIONS (LONDON).

MR. T. G. FARDELL (Paddington, S.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he has considered the petition recently presented to the Education Department, stating that, in the opinion of the School Board for London, some of the existing School Board divisions are too large for electoral purposes, and praying the Education Department to move Parliament to re-arrange for electoral purposes such divisions as they may deem necessary; and whether the Education Department propose introducing a Bill in Parliament this Session to remedy the grievance?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The petition has been received and considered, but I believe the Government do not intend to bring in a Bill on the subject.

TRUCK ACT 1896.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any steps have been taken by the Home Office towards the enforcement of the Truck Act 1896, so far as it relates to shop assistants?

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): No, Sir; the Act does not require the Secretary of State to enforce its provisions in shops or provide any means for his so doing.

*SIR C. DILKE: Am I to understand the Home Secretary to say that he is not taking any steps similar to those he is taking in regard to the railways?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: So far as any steps with regard to the railways are concerned, I am in correspondence with them with reference to the provisions of the Act.

*SIR C. DILKE: Are these steps taken by the Home Secretary as to the railways only so far as they come within the Factory Acts? I understood he was taking steps as to the railways generally.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I am in communication with the railway companies, but I have no special power under the Act over them or over shops.

*SIR C. DILKE: My Question really was whether the Home Secretary had taken any such friendly steps with regard to the shops as he has taken in the case of the railways.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: If I could see my way, I would be only too pleased to do so.

NORTH MUNDHAM SCHOOL BOARD.

*MR. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education what has been the result of the Department's communication with the North Mundham School Board relative to the use of the Church Catechism in their school; and whether the Department is aware that the Catechism is still taught in the school?

SIR J. GORST: The result is that the Board have instructed their staff not to teach those parts of the Church Catechism which are distinctive of any particular denomination. The Committee of Council are not aware that any part of the Church Catechism which is distinctive of any particular denomination is now being taught in the school.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to understand that the Church Catechism may be used in Board Schools if it be not used in its entirety? ["Order, order!"]

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not the Question on the Paper, which has been answered.

RIVER FEALE FISHING.

MR. MICHAEL FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if he is aware that although licences to fish on the River Feale and its tributaries were issued in March last to rod anglers by the licence agent in Listowel, the men so licensed have been prosecuted for fishing in the close season at the Listowel Petty Sessions Court on 26th April 1897, and that on the application of the solicitor to the Fishery Conservators the cases were adjourned and again further heard on the 10th May and dismissed; also that fresh summonses were issued for the same offence, and again postponed at the request of the Conservators' solicitor; and whether, owing to the great inconvenience and expense caused to the anglers, steps will be taken to prevent further prosecutions?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The facts are substantially as stated in the Question. Licences were issued on the 26th of March under which the fishermen erroneously supposed that they were entitled to fish before the termination of the close time on the 30th of April. They were warned by the Water Bailiffs that they were in error in so assuming, but persisted in fishing. Summonses which had been served for this offence were, in all but one case, either dismissed or had "no appearance" entered on them. Thereupon the Conservators, as they were entitled to do, took out fresh summonses for these offences. The Executive have no power to interfere in the matter.

MR. FLAVIN: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question on that reply. The prosecutor in this case is the Secretary to the Fishery Board of Limerick. He wrote a letter last— [*cries of* "Order, order!"]

UXBRIDGE UNION.

MR. J. BIGWOOD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the inadequate representation of the precinct of Norwood, Middlesex, upon the Board of Guardians of the Uxbridge Union; and if so, whether he would be disposed to sanction an increase of the representation of Norwood upon that Board commensurate with and in proportion to the common fund of the Union?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): The number of Guardians for the parishes in the Uxbridge Union has been fixed by the Middlesex County Council, and any application for an increased number of Guardians for the precinct should be brought under the attention of the County Council, who are empowered by Section 60 (1) of the Local Government Act, 1894, to increase the number of the Guardians if they consider there are sufficient grounds for such increase.

HYDE PARK (FOOTPATHS).

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware of the present highly unsatisfactory state of the footpaths in Hyde Park; whether he has taken any steps to ameliorate their condition since last year, when they were in a similar state, and when the fact was brought to his notice; and whether he will take immediate action in order to remedy the defect, at least as regards the pathways on the south side, which are so much used at the present season of the year, by having them covered with a good binding quality of gravel, if shell material is, as alleged, difficult to procure?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The paths in Hyde Park alluded to were a short time since in excellent condition, but in consequence of the prevalence of the dry and windy weather, with the enormous traffic upon them, they have become loose and rough, though they are rolled and watered every day. Everything is being done to meet the complaint of the hon. and gallant Member.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I should like to ask whether similar climatic influences do not exist in almost every country of Europe, and whether they do not contrive to keep their paths in good condition nevertheless? [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

ARGENTINE CATTLE TRADE.

SIR JOHN KINLOCH (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that vessels engaged in the Argentine cattle trade have cattle stowed not only on both sides of the upper deck, but also in the centre of the vessel, on the top of the closed hatches, leaving a very narrow gangway between the rows of cattle, along which the crew must pass for the working of the ship, and which is liable to become blocked by cattle "fetching away;" and whether, as this may be a source of danger to the working of the ship, the Board of Trade can take any steps to prevent such overcrowding?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston, on behalf of Mr. RITCHIE): The Regulations of the Argentine Government allow cattle to be carried on the top of the closed hatches, as well as on both sides of the vessel, provided that the stalls are of strong construction and solidly attached to the vessel. But the cattle are not allowed upon any place necessary for the navigation of the vessel. The Board of Trade have no reason to believe that sufficient room is not left for the working of the ship, or that there is any necessity for action on their part.

CAVALRY RECRUITS.

MR. JAMES HOZIER (Lanark, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether great care will be taken to point out to cavalry recruits that they can no longer enlist for special cavalry regiments, but can only enlist for the corps of Household Cavalry, the corps of Dragoons, the corps of Hussars, or the corps of Lancers, as the case may be?

MR. BRODRICK: Care is taken to make it clear to recruits that they enlist for a corps, and not for a regiment. The practice of enlisting for cavalry corps has been in force upwards of four years, and any recruit asking for a particular cavalry regiment is told that he cannot be enlisted for it.

MILITIA FIELD OFFICERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that Militia Field Officers who happen to reside out of the county with which their regiment is connected, and who send their chargers direct to the place for annual training, receive no allowance for the conveyance of their chargers outside the county; and whether he is aware that this is one of those extra expenses which tends to deter retired Army officers, whose services are valuable, from accepting commissions as field officers in the Militia?

MR. BRODRICK: The Militia being essentially a local force, it is desirable that officers and men of a Militia battalion should reside within the county to which it belongs; and, therefore, it is not considered necessary to give travelling expenses for either officers or their chargers beyond the county limits when they assemble at headquarters. If a battalion is sent elsewhere for training travelling expenses for the whole journey is provided by the public, that is, from the place of assembly to the place of training.

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

MR. A. J. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education if he would explain to the House what is meant in the Report of the Committee on the distribution of Science and Art grants by the possession in counties and county boroughs of an organisation for the promotion of secondary education; whether technical instruction committees, or School Boards (having organised Science Schools or Science and Art Classes) are to be understood as being amongst such organisations, and as constituting an authority responsible for Science and Art instruction within its area; and what will be the organisation in districts where both such authorities are or many be in operation?

*SIR J. GORST: The term "organisation for the promotion of secondary education" appears to allude to bodies established by law in Welsh counties and to voluntary combinations of public bodies to prevent overlapping which exist in some, and are desirable in all, English counties. Technical instruction committees and School Boards would come within the category if they were generally accepted as the medium for the dispensation of the Science and Art grants. In districts where no voluntary combination is made, and where rival authorities are in operation, the proposals of the Departmental Committee for preventing overlapping cannot be carried into effect without legislation.

LEAD POISONING.

MR. R. MCKENNA (Monmouth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of James A. Garvey, aged 17, a lead filer, lately employed at the Electrical Power Storage Company's works, Millwall, who died recently from the effects of lead poisoning; whether he is aware that there was one bath at the works at which from 40 to 50 boys were employed, and that the regulation compelling the use of the bath was habitually disregarded; and whether he proposes to take any steps under the circumstances?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: My attention has been called to this case, but I am unable to find on inquiry that there has been any breach of the Factory Acts or the Special Rules which have been made for electric accumulator works. Employers are required by those Rules to provide a bath. This was done at the works in question, and a time for bathing appointed for each person employed. It is not obligatory at present, however, on the workers to use the bath, and I regret to find that at these works bathing has often been omitted. It may become necessary to take steps to remedy this.

FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND).

MR. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, seeing that the new cruiser for the Fishery Board for Scotland is to be delivered on or before the 1st July 1897, will he say whether the contract has been signed; and, if so, will he state the date of the contract and the name of the contractor?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The question of the larger of the two vessels to be acquired during the present financial year is still under the anxious consideration of the Fishery Board, but matters have not yet reached such a stage as to admit of the contract being placed in the hands of any firm. It has, however, been ascertained that it would be impossible to have the vessel built by the 1st July.

IRISH SCHOOLS (EPIDEMIC DISEASE).

MR. J. L. CAREW (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) is he aware that in Ireland the sanitary authority has no power to have schools closed for the protection of public health in the case of epidemics breaking out, while in England the sanitary authority has such power conferred upon it; and (2) will the Government extend the same salutary protective power to Ireland?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The facts, I believe, are correctly stated in the first paragraph, though in England the managers of a school may appeal to the Education Department if they consider the notice requiring the school to be closed unreasonable. I should not like to answer the second paragraph without having an opportunity of consulting the Commissioners of National Education and taking their views.

CUSTOM HOUSE (LONDON).

MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will inquire into the loss and inconvenience caused to the trade of London by the position of the Custom House with its long river frontage, at present not used, and which space is urgently required by the fishing and coasting trades?

MR. HANBURY: A full inquiry was made in 1881 into the question of the situation of the Custom House and its advantage or otherwise to the trade of London, which is, of course, much larger than the fishing and coasting trades mentioned in the Question. The London Corporation at that time wished to buy the site in order to enlarge Billingsgate market. It was found that its proximity to the Bank of England and the principal merchants and brokers was of great advantage to trade. It was also shown that if the site were occupied by a market or commercial buildings the block of traffic in and about Lower Thames Street —which is considerable now—would become much worse. While this is the case few would wish to see the Custom House building replaced by a row of warehouses, especially as the present quay is thrown open to the public and affords a much-needed open space for recreation in a thickly-populated district of the East-end.

NEWBLISS PETTY SESSIONS COURTHOUSE (CO. MONAGHAN).

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland does he intend to take such steps as may prevent the Petty Sessions Courthouse at Newbliss, County Monaghan, being used for the purposes of faction during the forthcoming Orange anniversaries in Ulster?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to the reply given by me on this subject to the hon. Member's previous Question of the 4th February last.

LIGHT RAILWAYS (IRELAND).

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what sum has been given to the County Kerry for the construction or in aid of railways out of the total amount voted by Parliament last year?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No portion of the money provided by the Act of last year has been allocated to Kerry in aid of the construction of railways, but a coach service between Listowel and Tarbert has been arranged for, as well as a steamer service between Tarbert and Kilrush. Under the Act of 1883, a capital sum of £250,000 has been expended in Kerry, to the dividends on which the Treasury contribute 2 per cent., and under the Act of 1889 a sum of £135,000 was expended in the county on railways in the form of free grants.

DUTY ON HERRINGS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state on what ground the Foreign Office assumes there would be no advantage in making representations to the Governments of Russia and Austria to give effect to the recommendations in the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland in regard to a reduction in the duty on herrings imported from Scotland into those countries?

MR. CURZON: The ground of the assumption to which the hon. Member refers is that under the circumstances there appears to be no reasonable chance of inducing the Russian Government to acquiesce in a reduction of the duty.

MR. WEIR: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has made any efforts to obtain a reduction?

MR. CURZON: There is no use in making efforts that are foredoomed to failure.

WORKMISTRESSES (IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS).

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state if there is any intention on the part of the Government to redress the grievances under which workmistresses in National Schools in Ireland labour?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have already more than once stated that certain proposals had been made in relation to the remuneration of workmistresses, but that the Treasury, having given these representations their best consideration, were unable to sanction the proposals. I am afraid I have no further information to give the hon. Member.

LONDONDERRY LUNATIC ASYLUM.

MR. VESEY KNOX (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury will be explain why the Irish Board of Works have refused to grant a loan at less than 3½ per cent. to the governors of the Londonderry Lunatic Asylum, though the loan would be secured on the rates of the city and county of Derry; whether he is aware that 3 per cent. stock has recently been issued at par, secured on the rates of the city alone; whether the payment required by the Treasury on account of sinking fund is 2 per cent. if the loan be for 50 years, and 5 per cent. if the loan be for 20 years, and at what rates of interest this sinking fund is calculated to be invested; and whether, having regard to the general complaints of high interest charged to local authorities in Ireland, he will include in the Public Works Loans Bill any provisions dealing with this matter?

MR. HANBURY: The Irish Board of Works could not, of course, grant a loan at less than 3½ per cent. without the sanction of the Treasury, and the Treasury see no reason for making Londonderry an exception to the general rule for similar cases. The history of that rule is this: Up to 1893 Lunatic Asylum Loans bore interest at 3½ per cent., and were repayable within 14 years only. In 1894, under the authority of the Public Works Loans (No. 3) Act of 1893, the Treasury fixed 3½ per cent. as the rate for loans for permanent works repayable during 35 years, and 3¾ when the period was 50 years. In June, 1895, the late Board of Treasury arranged to make 3½ per cent. the rate for all periods up to 50 years, and allowed 50 years even for such non-permanent purposes as the purchase of furniture. The terms for Irish Lunatic Asylums Loans are in that respect unprecedented. There are no other loans running for 50 years which pay less interest, not even those for the housing of the working classes, and many others offer equally good security. It must be remembered, too, that the Local Loans Stock is a 3 per cent. stock not redeemable till 1912, and even at present rates the fund little more than covers its expenses. The local authorities in Ireland are not charged more than local authorities in Great Britain. Lunatic asylum expenditure is under the Grand Juries, and the Irish Government have been considering the question of allowing the local authority to borrow in he open market. To such a proposal the Treasury would not be opposed.

MR. KNOX: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Governors of the Londonderry Lunatic Asylum declaring that the terms for Board of Works loans are excessive, and declining to take any more money on such terms; and whether, the governors may under the present law borrow from the general public by the issue of Stock or otherwise, and if they have no such power, whether he will propose to confer it upon them by legislation?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A Bill has already been drafted containing a provision enabling Lunatic Asylums to be erected or enlarged by means of the creation of Stock. Such Stock would, however, be issued by Grand Juries and not by the Governors of Asylums. In view of the changes in local Government in Ireland, which it is proposed to carry out next Session, I had some doubts whether it was worth while to proceed with this Bill, but I am quite ready to introduce it and endeavour to secure its passage if unopposed.

Mr. KNOX asked whether the right hon. Gentleman, after the Bill had been introduced, would get it through at once if he understood there was no opposition?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes I am quite ready to do that.

BURIAL (PREMATURE).

Mr. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made by the London Association for the Prevention of Premature Burial, in *The Lancet* of 24th April, that in England and Wales 16,000 persons are annually buried without medical certificates of any sort; and whether the Government will take the matter into its serious consideration so as to prevent as much as possible persons being prematurely buried?

***Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY**: I have not seen the statement to which the hon. Member alludes, but it is not the case that 16,000 persons are buried annually without medical certificates. The number of uncertified deaths in 1896 was 11,464; and there has been a steady decrease for many years past, both in the actual number of such deaths and in the proportion which they bear to the total number of deaths. No cases of premature burial have been brought to my notice, nor am I aware that it is a matter which falls within my jurisdiction; but in any case I am unable to see that the obtaining a certificate of death would be a guarantee against a premature burial taking place.

Mr. MACDONA: Arising out of that answer, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is not aware that a number of medical men entertain the opinion that a great number of people are buried prematurely?

***Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY**: No, Sir; I am not. Certificates of death when given are given by the medical men. Therefore it follows that, in their opinion, the persons in regard to whom the certificates are given are dead.

ROOSKEY BRIDGE (COUNTY ROSCOMMON).

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland who is responsible for the state of the wearing of the public road at the old mill-race of the canal cutting at the bridge of Rooskey, county Roscommon; is he aware that Thomas Carroll, of Rooskey, was nearly killed by a fall there on 5th January last; whether the Shannon Commissioners, or the Board of Works, or the Grand Jury of Roscommon is responsible for the unprotected condition of this place at the point; and, will he make any representations to those responsible to effect a repair for the protection of the public?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: I have communicated with the county Surveyor, who is making inquiries into the matter. He reports to me that a space of about three feet exists between the parapet of the bridge and the end of the fence built along the canal many years ago, by, it is believed, the Shannon Commissioners. It is through this space that Thomas Carroll walked and met with the accident. It is under consideration whether it may not be possible to build up this space or erect some barrier to prevent such accidents in future.

STORNOWAY AND CARLOWAY ROAD.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the fact that the road between Stornoway and Carloway, which was authorised during the time Lord Lothian was Secretary for Scotland, and at his suggestion was so made as to admit of the construction of a light railway, has recently been surveyed by the Highland Railway Company, and that there is every reason to believe that this Company would undertake to construct and work a light railway between Stornoway and Carloway so soon as the road is complete, will the Government, having regard to the impetus that such a railway would give to the development of the fishing industry on the Atlantic Seaboard of Lewis, consider the expediency of taking steps to secure the completion of the road.

***The LORD ADVOCATE**: The road in question was, graded and was provided with bridges which no doubt would carry a light railway if the road were satisfactory completed. But the Secretary for Scotland can give no undertaking at present as to the completion of the road.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate how many miles of the Carloway Road have been completed; how many miles of the road have yet to be made; and can he state approximately the length of road which will have been completed when the balance of the grant now in hand has been expended?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The first section for about 4¼ miles from Stornoway has been completed. The third and fourth sections, from Braesclete (3¾ miles) and Carloway Harbour (6½ miles) to the junction of those roads, are about three-fourths completed. The second section, from the end of No. 1 section to the junction of roads to Carloway Harbour and Braesclete (6 miles,) is hardly commenced. The probable total length of road which will be completed when the remainder of the grant is expended on it will not exceed 5½ miles.

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS.)

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the Arbitrator's award in the Port Ness Harbour dispute is now in the hands of the Scottish Office, will he state whether advantage is being taken of the summer weather to advance the work; will he state the number of men employed on the works; will he consider the desirability of blowing up and clearing away the rock in the entrance way to the Harbour; and will he state when he expects the work to be completed?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: No work on Port Ness Harbour is being done at present. There are no men employed by Government on this work. It is not considered necessary to remove any more rock in the entrance to the Harbour, this being already reduced to low water level which is that of the Harbour. It is not known when the work will be completed; this will depend on the action of the trustees.

RURAL POSTMEN (IRELAND).

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, is it intended to increase the number of rural postmen, in view of the contemplated house-to-house delivery of letters in the country districts of Ireland?

MR. HANBURY: Yes. There can be no doubt that the number of rural postmen will be increased.

AGRICULTURAL RATING ACT (IRELAND.)

MR. W. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the £74,000 accruing to Ireland under the Agricultural Rating Act is bearing interest; if so, how much, and for what purpose will it be used?

MR. HANBURY: The £74,000 was paid into the Irish Local Taxation Account at the Bank of Ireland at the end of the last financial year. No interest is ordinarily paid on moneys paid into the Local Taxation Accounts of any of the three kingdoms, and Parliament made no special provision for the £74,000 in the Act of last Session. If the Irish Government are advised that they have power to make some special arrangement with respect to the temporary employment of these moneys, the Treasury will be willing to consider any proposal submitted to them.

CERTIFICATED TEACHERS (SCOTLAND).

MR. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it is proposed to allow Irish certificated teachers to teach in State-aided schools in Scotland on the same terms as they are now allowed to teach in English Schools?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The matter to which the Question of the hon. Member refers has not been brought under the consideration of the Scotch Education Department since I gave a reply on the 5th March last, to the effect that no change has been made in regard to the recognition of Irish Certificates under the Scottish Code.

MR. DILLON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if, now the matter has been brought under the attention of the Scotch Education Department, they will follow the precedent set in England?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I cannot make that promise; but if a formal application be made to the Scotch Education Department the Committee of Council on Scotch Education will consider it.

CRETE.

MR. G. LAMBERT (Devon, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether as the state of affairs in Crete demands an early settlement of the question of government, the Powers have agreed as to the form of government to be conferred on the island?

Mr. CURZON: Although the Powers are agreed that Crete shall enjoy complete autonomy under the suzerainty of the Sultan, the details of the scheme are still under consideration, and it is not yet possible to make any announcement on the subject.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the right hon. Gentleman when he considered he would be able to make some statement on the subject?

Mr. CURZON: I should hesitate to give any promise.

TURCO-GREEK WAR (ARMISTICE).

Mr. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh) asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he could now state the terms of the armistice signed in Thessaly and the period for which it had been concluded?

Mr. CURZON: We understand from the Greek Chargé d'Affaires in this country, and from Her Majesty's Minister at Athens, that the following armistice was signed on the Taratza Hills near Lamia on the 20th instant:—

> "From 3.15 p.m. armistice is concluded between the belligerents. The troops will hold the line of outposts now in their possession. Flank movements are forbidden. The neutral zone between the two forces will be defined by superior officers on both sides on the 22nd of May."

There is no mention in the armistice of the period for which it is to remain in force, but according to information received from Mr. Egerton, the Turkish Commander-in-Chief in Thessaly considers that it has been concluded only for fifteen days.

CHARGE OF ROBBERY (CO. TYRONE).

Mr. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if the brothers Maguire, detained in prison for a very lengthened period on a charge of robbery from the person of a dead man named Triston, near Trillick, in the county Tyrone, can be assigned counsel to move in the superior courts for their liberation on bail, seeing they are reduced to the condition of paupers and are unable to provide legal assistance for themselves?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: I have no power to provide the legal assistance suggested. I may mention that a sum of £97. 8s. 5½d. was found upon the Maguires when arrested. £50 of this, which was in American money, was on the 10th of July, 1896 returned, and the balance £47. 8s. 5½d. retained by the authorities. The sum of £102. 2s. 1d. was paid by the Crown to the prisoners towards the expenses of their trial at the Winter Assizes in Belfast, and I am quite ready to direct that an adequate sum be returned to them out of the moneys in the hands of the authorities, to enable them to apply to be admitted on bail.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the London and North Western Railway Company now run some of their express trains to Holyhead in from half an hour to an hour less time than they take to carry the mails on the day service between London and Holyhead; whether, as the mail train service is so heavily subsidised by the Government, he will take steps to secure that the Irish mail trains on the day service are run at a speed at least equal to the 10.15 p.m. express train belonging to the same Company, which is not subsidised; and whether, in view of the strong representations made as to the inconvenience to the travelling public of the early departure of the Irish day mail trains from Euston and Westland Row, he proposes to alter the starting hour from Euston to 8.30 a.m. and from Westland Row to 7.45 a.m.?

Mr. HANBURY: One of the express trains from Euston, namely, the 10.15 p.m. train recently established, travels to Holyhead in 5 hours 15 minutes, while the day mail train, which leaves Euston at 7.15 a.m. occupied 6 hours and 5 minutes. The express train only makes one stop on the way, namely, at Crewe, but the day mail train stops at five intermediate stations. The speed of the day mail trains has not been accelerated, as the postal advantages to be secured were not such as appeared to justify the additional expense. The times of departure of the day mail trains from Euston and Westland Row respectively were fully considered in connection with the changes which took effect on the 1st April, but the interests of the mail service could not of course, be entirely sacrificed to the convenience of the passengers. The present hour of dispatch of the mail from Euston was therefore maintained, namely, 7.15 a.m., so as to secure an early delivery of the day mail letters in Dublin; but as regards the up mail, the Postmaster General was able so far to meet the desire in Ireland for a later dispatch from Westland Row as to fix the hour at 7.10 a.m., instead of at 6.40 a.m. Any later dispatch than 7.10 a.m. would have resulted, not only in a later delivery of the correspondence in London and other towns in England, but in a failure of connection via Chester and Preston with the day mail to Edinburgh and Glasgow.

Mr. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any steps have been taken to carry out the promise he gave some time ago for the improvement of the mail service to the south of Ireland by affording an earlier daily delivery of letters to Roscrea, Nenagh, Birr, and towns adjoining; or if he can state when, or how soon, the desired change may be effected for these localities?

Mr. HANBURY: The promise referred to was that the Postmaster General would take into consideration a suggestion that the day mail bags for Roscrea, Nenagh, Birr, etc., should be put out of the mail train from Dublin at Ballybrophy Junction and a goods train from that point utilized for their conveyance to destination. This suggestion has been placed before the Railway Company, who state that the alterations necessary to make the goods train available would result in serious inconvenience and that the suggestion is not one which they can adopt. There is no other way of accelerating the day mail service to the towns in question, at a cost which the post office would be justified in expending.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE (DUBLIN).

Mr. CAREW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when will the work of building the promised new College of Science in Dublin be commenced?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Until the Report of the Departmental Committee has been received and considered, t will not be possible to make any statement in reference to this matter.

SHORTHORN BULLS (IRELAND).

Mr. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on whose recommendation the Congested Districts Board have adopted the policy of buying shorthorn bulls in Scotland while there were over 400 offered in the Dublin Show and at Rodson's Sale in Belfast, and what success, if any, has attended this experiment?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Congested Districts Board, as a result of their own experience, decided to try the experiment of purchasing bulls that had not been made up for purposes of show or sale, as it was found that animals so made up were not sufficiently hardy for rough usage in the West of Ireland.

ADDERGOOLE AND BALLYNAGORAHER DISTRICT (CASTLEBAR UNION).

Dr. ROBERT AMBROSE (Mayo, W): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Castlebar Board of Guardians of 8th May, in which they declare the existence of grave distress in the Addergoole and Ballynagoraher districts, and the necessity for relief works to cope with such distress; and what action will he take with regard to such resolution?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have received a copy of the resolution referred to. Careful investigation has been made by the Local Government Board, since the resolution was passed, into the condition of the poorer classes in this district, and there does not appear to be any necessity for the adoption of exceptional measures, as suggested.

GLEBE ACT (IRELAND).

Mr. P. O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that clergymen in Ireland who wish to provide parochial houses under the Glebe Act are required to pay interest at the rate of five per cent. for a loan extending to a term of thirty years; and whether he will consider the advisability of granting such loans at a lower rate of interest for a longer term?

Mr. HANBURY: The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the interest on these loans is five per cent. It is only three-and-a-half per cent. The five per cent. charge covers repayment of principal as well as interest, and the period is 35 years, not 30. The terms are therefore much easier than the hon. Member appears to think.

SHIRLEY AND TENNISON ESTATES (COUNTY MONAGHAN).

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the decisions have been delivered in the cases heard at Carrickmacross on 18th March from the Shirley and Tennison estates, County Monaghan; and, whether he can say when the viewing of the farms was completed?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The inspection of the holdings referred to was completed last week, and it is expected that the Sub-Commission will be able to announce its decisions on the 31st instant.

GRAND JURY ACCOUNTS (COUNTY MONAGHAN).

Mr. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware if the promised audit of the accounts of the Secretary of the Grand Jury of county Monaghan has taken place; and whether he can say what sum has the Secretary to the Grand Jury of Monaghan been surcharged with on account of the illegal charge he has been making to road contractors for tender forms in the Barony of Farney.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The accounts of the Grand Jury of Monaghan have been audited. The question of the fees charged by the Secretary to the Grand Jury for these tender forms does not come before the Auditor in his audit of the County Accounts. The Auditor, however, understands that all tender forms are now only charged the statutory fee of sixpence.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the Bill for amending the Agricultural Holdings Act will be introduced?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I am afraid I can give no specific pledge on the subject of the hon. Member's Question.

Mr. LAMBERT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the President of the Board of Agriculture gave notice of the introduction of the Bill for the first day of last Session, and does he not think it is now time to do something?

[No answer was given.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FAITHFULL BEGG (Glasgow, St. Rollox): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of his intention to move an adjournment from Monday 21st to Thursday, 24th June, thereby depriving Members of the means of prosecuting Bills set down for the 23rd, he will undertake not to interfere with the position of Bills set down on 7th July, to which the House has given a Second Reading?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: As my hon. Friend is aware, the Government are under engagement to give two Wednesdays after Whitsuntide in order that there may be an opportunity for private Members to proceed with legislation commenced before Whitsuntide. The order in which Bills appear upon the Notice Paper for Wednesdays depends, I believe, upon fixed rules which do not depend upon the Government, therefore I cannot enter into any pledge with my hon. Friend with regard to any special Bill.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, can he indicate whether the terms of reference for the new Commission to inquire into the working of the Land Acts will be laid upon the Table of the House before the Whitsuntide Recess?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: It is not, of course, usual to lay upon the Table of the House the terms of reference to a Royal Commission.

MR. FARRELL asked if the terms would be stated before the House rose on June 4th.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY could not give any specific date upon which the terms of reference could be announced, but he hoped the date would not be a great distance of time.

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES BILL.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. H. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) in asking leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law respecting the Metropolitan Water Companies, explained that it was brought forward in fulfilment of an undertaking which he gave earlier in the Session. As the House was aware, the chief subject of controversy which surrounded the question of the London water supply had already been referred for inquiry to a Royal Commission. Pending the result of that inquiry it had been urged upon them, and the Government were of that opinion themselves that, something might be done with advantage to strengthen the position of the water consumer. The water consumer in the metropolis was often placed in a position of great disadvantage when he found himself in conflict with the water companies. At present, when the consumer found himself aggrieved his course was to go to the magistrates in some cases and to the Local Government Board in others. In applying to the Local Government Board he must be supported by 20 resident householders, and sometimes, owing to technical objections, their applications were found to be invalid. The present means of redress entailed upon each individual consumer great trouble and very often expenses they were quite unwilling to pay. That being so, what the Government proposed was not to alter, but add to the existing law. They proposed to do it in this way. They left the water consumers of the metropolis all the rights and remedies they possessed at present; they created an additional tribunal before which their complaints could be made, and called in the local authorities to aid and assist them. At present the complaints had to be initiated by the consumer; but under the Bill the local authorities would also be empowered to take the initiative, and the tribunal which was to hear their complaints would be the Railway and Canal Commission. They had chosen that tribunal for two reasons—first, because it was not too much overburdened with work at the present time; and, secondly, because it seemed to be very undesirable to create an entirely new tribunal for the purpose of giving effect to what must be after all only a temporary Measure until the Royal Commission had reported. The Bill was a very short one; it was also a simple and a modest Measure. The new powers and duties, however, which they were conferring on the local authorities must not be underrated, they were very considerable, and he was in great hopes that this proposal would be found to be an adequate fulfilment of the undertaking which he gave at an earlier period of the Session. [*Cheers.*]

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said that last year the Committee over which he had had the honour to preside on the London Water Bills passed unanimously a Report calling the attention of the House to the state of affairs which existed at present, than which, perhaps, nothing could be worse for so densely crowded a population as London. He was afraid the Bill which his right hon. Friend proposed to introduce was no remedy, and that palliatives of this character would only add to the evils which already existed. The local authority was not placed in a position to deal with the water companies or the water supply as in many towns. He thought the House must face before very long the grave difficulties which arose from the present position of affairs. If this great city, which was so constantly increasing in population, was to be kept thoroughly well supplied with water, there must be some principle laid down for handing to the local authority the supply, or giving to the water companies, under charge of Parliament, not merely regulations as regarded disputes, but general regulations which ought to apply to all the companies supplying London on a more extensive scale than that which was now proposed. ["Hear, hear!"]

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Ritchie, and Mr. T. W. Russell; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 267.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Order for Committee read.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said this Bill made a grant of public money in the schedule which provided that any arbitrator other than the County Court Judge should be paid out of money provided by Parliament. He thought that the making of a charge in the schedule to a Bill was most novel, and so far as he could ascertain without precedent. He thought they ought to have the Committee of Ways and Means before they considered that part of the schedule.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That Committee has already been set up.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the question remained whether it would be necessary to take the Committee of Ways and Means before the schedule, or the clause which incorporated the schedule. The charge, he believed, resided in the first clause.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Money Committee (there is no question of the Committee of Ways and Means) for authorising the grant of money for the expenses involved in the Bill must be taken before the third section of the second schedule is reached. That is the charging part of the Bill. All that the first clause of the Bill says is that compensation is to be settled by arbitration "in accordance with the second schedule to this Act." That does not fix what the terms of the second schedule are to be. Those are to be settled after the first clause has been passed, and when the second schedule is reached. There is nothing in the first clause to say that the terms of the second schedule shall be the identical terms in which it stands. The House may alter it, or even strike out the power to refer to any one of the County Court Judges, and the consequent charges, but no charge can be dealt with by the Committee under that third clause of the second schedule until a Resolution in a Money Committee has been passed.

The following Notices relating to the Order stood upon the Paper:—

SIR JOHN JENKINS: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert clauses in the Bill with a view to provide that the owners of royalties shall contribute to the compensation paid in respect of accidents that take place in the course of the carrying on of a trade or industry in respect of which they receive such royalties."

MR. PICKERSGILL: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions for a scheme of insurance under State supervision to secure to workmen the payment of the amounts of compensation which may be awarded to them under the Bill."

MR. McKENNA: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert clauses in the Bill with a view to amending the law of Employers' Liability, in respect of those trades or industries to which the Bill does not otherwise apply."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions in the Bill to enable employers of workmen in mines and quarries to deduct yearly out of any royalties payable by them to any landowners or persons in respect of any mines, minerals, or substances won, gotten, raised, or worked out of or in such mines and quarries a sum not greater than one-half the yearly sum paid, or which would be required to be paid, by the said employers for insuring themselves against liability for compensation under the Bill."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions in the Bill in order that the burden of compensation to be paid under this Bill by employers of workmen in mines and quarries may be distributed and borne equitably between such employers and the owners of all royalties payable by such employers in respect of all mines, minerals, and substances won, gotten, raised, or worked out of or in such mines and quarries."

MR. TENNANT: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions to secure compensation to workmen for injuries to health arising out of and in the course of their employment."

MR. BUTCHER: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to introduce into the Bill such provisions as may be necessary to abolish the doctrine of common employment as affecting the right of a workman to compensation for personal injury."

MR. SETON-KARR: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions in the Bill that, in the event of any employer or employers being proved financially unable to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade to pay the compensation that may become payable under this Bill, or any part of it that the Board of Trade have power to remit all or any part of such compensation as may be deemed equitable, consideration being given to the fact as to whether the said employers have used all proper and statutory precautions to prevent accident."

MR. HAROLD RECKITT: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert clauses in the Bill with a view to provide for the compensation of workmen where the employer is a foreign shipowner without assets in this country."

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE: To move,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to make the State liable to pay compensation under the Bill."

*MR. SPEAKER: There are several Instructions on the Paper with reference to the First Order of the Day, Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill. These I will now deal with. The first Instruction, standing in the name of the hon. Member for Carmarthen Boroughs, and the two which stand in the name of the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan, propose to deal with the relations of lessors and lessees of mines. That subject, I think, is outside the scope of the Bill, which relates wholly to the relations of employers and employed, nor does the fact that the lessee happens to be the employer of a workman in a mine affect the point. The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Bethnal Green and also that of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Tyneside)—the one proposing a scheme of insurance under State supervision, and the other a scheme for State insurance—are both out of order as being outside the scope of the Bill and involving a charge on the revenue. Then there is the Instruction of the hon. Member for North Monmouth, which seeks to insert clauses with a view to amend the law of employers' liability in respect of those trades or industries to which the Bill does not apply. At present the Bill applies only to certain trades, and it will be competent to hon. Members to propose to add other trades, but it will not be competent by Instruction or otherwise to deal by way of amendment with the law relating to trades which are excluded from the Bill, both as it stands at present, and as it ultimately may stand. The Instruction standing in the name of the hon. Member for Berwick proposes to empower the Committee to insert provisions to secure compensation to workmen for injuries to health arising out of and in the course of their employment. If the Bill were not expressly limited on the face of it to injuries arising from accidents I should have said that that matter might have been dealt with by way of amendment without an Instruction; but, having regard to the express terms of the Bill, I am of opinion that the Instruction is necessary and it is in order. The Amendment of the hon. Member for York proposes to introduce provisions to abolish the doctrine of common employment as affecting the right to compensation. As regards any trades that are included in, or may be added to the list in the Bill, of course that might be done by Amendment, and no Instruction is necessary; as regards other trades, the Instruction would not be in order, as the law affecting them is outside the scope of the Bill. The Amendment of the hon. Member for St. Helens, dealing with the case of employers who may be financially unable to pay compensation, is out of order, because the matter can be dealt with by way of Amendment. The Amendment of the hon. Member for the Brigg Division is out of order. It proposes to insert clauses to provide for the compensation of workmen where the employer is a foreign shipowner without assets in this country. Seamen are not at present included in the Bill; if it be intended to include them, such inclusion can only cover the case of seamen employed in the United Kingdom or on British ships. For that no Instruction would be necessary. If it is intended to cover the case of seamen employed by foreign shipowners on foreign ships, that would be outside the scope of an Instruction, if not altogether outside the powers of Parliament. That disposes of all the Instructions except that of the hon. Member for Berwickshire.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) accordingly rose to move:—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions to secure compensation to workmen for injuries to health arising out of and in the course of their employment."

His first contention was that the man whose health was undermined was more deserving of pity and of compensation than the man who met with an accident, grievous though that was. Because, while both were prevented from working, the man whose health was injured transmitted to his children a weakly and impaired organisation which unfitted them for the struggle of life. His second proposition was that there were many very sad cases of illness which were contracted through no fault of either employer or employed. In illustration of that he took the case of the Sheffield file-makers, and quoted from the Report of the Registrar General, who found that 1,667 file-makers died as compared with 1,000 in other trades at corresponding ages and periods, and that the mortality from lead-poisoning was twice as great in that trade as in other classes and occupations. The Registrar General further mentioned that had it been possible to compile a column dealing with the file-cutters, as distinguished from the file-makers, a still higher percentage of mortality would have been shown. As regarded the case of the lead-workers in Newcastle, through the kindness of Dr. Oliver, who presided over the infirmary, he had ascertained that fact that in seven years from 1890 228 cases of lead-poisoning were admitted to that institution, 10 of which resulted fatally. Dr. Oliver added that the numbers stated gave no criterion of the total number of the cases occurring in the district, because many of the workmen who were ill went to the doctor at the works. These lead-workers had no trade organisation and no benefit society, and the result was that when they broke down from lead-poisoning they were nearly always thrown on the rates. If the Bill were to deal with accidents which arose from nobody's negligence, it was obvious that it should also include cases where health was undermined simply through the nature of the employment. But if the Government would agree to the Instruction, he would accept a provision restricting compensation to the cases in which negligence could be proved against the employer. The Colonial Secretary had maintained that it would be extremely difficult to prove that the injury to health resulted from the employment. There were many cases, however, where there could be no doubt. He would mention some. A girl, aged 17, employed for three years in the lead process of the Pottery trade, had to go to hospital for lead poisoning, and left almost totally blind. Another girl, of the same age, and in the same employment, was attacked with partial paralysis, and after 12 weeks in hospital was discharged, but with the loss of her sight. Representations had been made to her employers, but nothing had been done for her. Another girl, aged 18, who had been employed in the lead process as a dipper since January 1896, was seized with a fit in the January of this year, and had now been discharged from hospital with the loss of sight in one eye, and with her general health so impaired that she could not hope ever to be able to work again. The Government had urged that if these cases were included in the Bill, the Measure would be very difficult to pass. The time of the House could not be more fitly occupied than in the discussion of proposals to give, not justice, for that was impossible, but some small compensation to those who had lost the greatest gift of life. ["Hear, hear!"]

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): There is a great deal of force and truth in what the hon. Member says as to its being equally sad, whether a workman be rendered incapable of earning his livelihood by disease or by accident. And I take the opportunity of offering my thanks to the hon. Member for his services to the Home Office in respect of the adoption of precautions in the case of dangerous trades. It takes some time to introduce these; but it is being done more and more; and much of the improvement is due to the hon. Member. But when we are asked to put into a Bill which is to provide for compensation in case of unexpected accidents provisions for compensation in case of injury to health resulting from employment in a dangerous trade, we are asked to do something of which the definition is difficult and which will open the door to much dispute and litigation. The position is not the same as it was with the Bill of 1893. We are providing for accidents alone under this Bill, and to that extent we abolish the doctrine of *volenti non fit injuria*. But in the cases quoted by the hon. Member, though the trades mentioned are well known to be dangerous, the effect upon the health is very different with different persons. Women are much more injuriously affected than men. There is a broad and substantial difference between a person who is injured by an accident and one who is injured by the nature of the trade in which he is employed. If the obligation be thrown upon the employer to compensate the latter, it will be made necessary for him not to employ men or women who are likely to suffer in health; and that would not be a very good thing for the workpeople. At present, if a workman suffers injury to health in the course of his employment in a dangerous trade, and can show that it is due to the negligence of his master or foreman in not applying the necessary precautions, then he has a remedy against the master. And, though I do not say that that is a satisfactory remedy, I think that the House would be wise not to introduce into a Bill dealing with accidents the far more complicated and difficult question of the permanent injury to health caused by some trades. It may be difficult for the arbitrator under this Bill to decide any of the questions which will be brought before him. But in the case of the diseases brought on by the lead industry, how much more difficult will it be for him to say that a particular condition of bodily health is due to the industry and not to the constitution of the individual? I hope the House will not accept an Instruction which will complicate the whole Bill and render it almost impossible to carry out.

MR. R. B. HALDANE (Haddington) said that it was difficult to see on what theory the Home Secretary rested his exclusion of this class of case. The Bill proposed to make provision for the injured workman; and now the Government were drawing a distinction between two classes of injuries and declaring that the one should carry compensation and that the other should not. The right hon. Gentleman had said that this Amendment would not be in the interests of the working classes, because it would keep those who were delicate and susceptible to injury out of employment. Surely that was one of the strongest arguments in favour of the Instruction. ["Hear, hear!"] It was the only way to make prevention really effective. If they put on the employer the burden of seeing that the material used in the course of his trade were not injurious to the health of the workers, they would most certainly have a substantial diminution in the numbers of cases of chemical poisoning. It was impossible to defend the position of the Government in the matter. He could understand them saying, "We must not overload the Bill." But why select for exclusion those cases of injuries to health which nothing but the skill, knowledge, and means of the employer could avoid. A curious case of explosion from blasting gelatine, a substance nearly akin to cordite, had recently come under his notice. The substance was set on fire in the midst of two or three workmen with apparently no evil effects to them. However, in the course of a few days they were attacked with what appeared to be acute bronchitis, and died, but the post-mortem examinations showed that the cause of death was chemical poisoning. Those were the cases to which the Instruction proposed to extend the protection of the Bill. If the Bill were to be really useful they must include within its operation all classes of injuries to health and body which arose directly in the course of employment. If the Government desired to lighten the

Bill, let them not put outside its scope the very class of cases it was most important they should bring inside—the class of cases in which prevention was essential and in which that prevention could only be got by that scientific skill which only the knowledge, experience, and means of the employer could supply.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) thought the Instruction was impracticable. If a workman employed in several employments broke down in health, it would be impossible to say in which of the employments the man's health was affected.

*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Instruction was eminently necessary; and it came with peculiar grace from an hon. Member who was connected indirectly with the chemical trade, and who had great experience of the subject as Chairman of the Committee on Dangerous Trades. He had heard with alarm the statement of the Home Secretary that dangerous trades could not be included in the Bill. The Bill would apply to something like six millions of workmen, and he ventured to say that if the Instruction were accepted not 7,000 would come under the Bill for compensation in 10 years. Cases of the kind were not large in number; but they were very acute in the amount of pain and disablement they imposed on workmen, and for that reason alone he thought the Instruction should be accepted. He would, for the purposes of illustration take the cases of two strong men, who left the Army and joined the Reserve. One of the men went into a chemical factory. After three or four years' employment his health was undermined, he became physically a most pitiable spectacle. He was no longer fit for work, and he drifted to the workhouse, the Salvation Army shelter, or the doss-house. The other man became a navvy on a railway. Through an accident, probably due to his own negligence, he had a leg cut off? But instead of being cast adrift like the first man, he got £200 or £300 compensation, and possibly the company provided him with an easy gatekeeper's job at a low rate of wages. If the first man whose health was undermined in the course of his employment got compensation, he would be able to go into the country to recuperate, and possibly, with the aid of his friendly society, he would be able to start in some little business such as selling newspapers, or he and his wife keeping a mangle, or in other ways made independent of the community on which without this Instruction he would be a burden. The most pathetic figures he knew of in the army of industry were the chemical workers of Lancashire and the lead workers of Newcastle; and he was bound to say the Home Secretary had not advanced a single argument for the exclusion of those men from the protection of the Bill.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the Instruction practically amounted to a proposal that industry should be liable to compensate the widows of men who died at any age substantially lower than the average term of the life of men engaged in such trades. That was a serious prospect to contemplate. The hon. Member for Berwickshire had referred to the file-cutting trade. The hon. Member must have meant the hand file-cutting trade, and not the machine file-cutting trade.

*MR. TENNANT: Hear, hear!

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said the scientific opinion which the hon. Member had cited in support of his proposal undoubtedly applied to the hand file-cutting trade. But if the Instruction were passed, there was no earthly doubt that the hand file-cutting trade would entirely disappear. A number of small employers would be driven out of the trade, and machinery would be universally introduced. He must refuse to be a party to the bringing about of such a result. The Bill as it stood went quite as far as the public had got notice of, and it would not be fair for the House to extend its operations further.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said that if it were a just principle that industries should bear the burden of injuries to health and to limb, he failed to see how the Government could oppose the Instruction. The Home Secretary seemed under the impression that health had nothing to do with the Bill. Health had a great deal to do with it. A slight accident to a man in bad health might develop serious consequences. Was his employer to compensate him while employers in industries which produced a general condition of ill-health escaped? The workman whose health was injured in his occupation was as much entitled to compensation as the workman who might lose his arm or leg or sustain other bodily injuries. On this ground he would support the Instruction.

Mr. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthen, E.) said he understood that one of the principles on which the Bill was founded was that where a workman was injured in a dangerous trade the employer should be liable. He should have thought the principle applied a thousand times more strongly to cases where a man was slowly and surely poisoned in a noxious trade. This should be provided for as much as cases where workmen had their feet cut off or their legs broken, or sustained similar injuries. It was said that then the wife of every man engaged in dangerous employment who died would be entitled to something from his employer. It meant nothing of the kind. The Instruction simply meant what it said, that if a trade had poisoned a person the relatives would have a right of action against the employer. He could not see any difference between the case where a man was poisoned by his trade, and the case where a man received personal injuries in the course of his employment.

Mr. C. B. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) submitted that the Instruction went further than the speech in support of it, which confined it to certain dangerous trades that were enumerated. He was glad the Home Secretary refused to accept the Instruction. It would be injurious to the working man if such an Instruction were carried, and equally so to employers of labour. The Bill itself would create many difficulties in regard to employment, but if the Instruction were adopted it would shut out from employment in a large number of industries not regarded as dangerous a great many people who for some years had been following them, who although their health was not strong were capable of doing a day's work and earning a day's wage. Because he believed the Instruction would have this undesirable effect he should vote against it.

Mr. J. M. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland) thought hon. Members were losing sight of the question before the House. This was not an Amendment. All his hon. Friend was asking was that the House should have an opportunity of discussing the matter. If the Government were to be deterred by difficulties from dealing with points in the Bill the Government should have thought twice before asking the House to accept the principle of the Bill. He believed the difficulty involved in the Instruction could be overcome. If the proposal of the Instruction when brought forward by Amendment in Committee were reasonably objected to as impossible to carry out, or for some other reason, the Committee could reject the Amendment. But if the Instruction were not adopted, his hon. Friend could not bring forward in Committee the just and reasonable proposal embodied in it.

Sir EDWARD HILL (Bristol, S.) trusted the House would not listen to the Instruction, because he believed it would complicate the Bill. This was a Bill relating to accidents, not illnesses, and while he and others would grant compensation for the former, they objected to the latter.

*Sir C. DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said there seemed to be a misapprehension as to the class of labour to which the Instruction referred. The Mover of the Instruction had in view the match-making and white lead industries and the pottery trade. It was said to be impossible to deal with the matter under this Bill. But it was dealt with in the legislation of every country that had faced the subject, and it was intended to be dealt with in the legislation of other countries which were beginning to face the subject. In five Continental countries it had been found impossible to separate the two questions. The Instruction only proposed to allow the subject to be dealt with in Committee.

Sir ARTHUR FORWOOD (Lancashire, Ormskirk) said the House was regarding the matter from an erroneous point of view. He ventured to say that this Instruction went too far. If it had been limited to the neglect of an employer to take reasonable precautions for the mitigation of risk then he should have been glad to support it. As it was, the Instruction would go into every trade and undoubtedly it would lead to great difficulty and litigation. He should move after the word "employment," to insert:—

"Through the failure of the employer to take reasonable precautions in employments injurious to the health for the mitigation or removal of the risk of injury to the health in such employment."

Mr. G. WYNDHAM (Dover) said this Amendment would place a penalty on the employer for neglecting certain precautions, which was not consistent with the spirit of the Bill. If the hon. Member had made a Motion limiting it to certain trades in which diseases were contracted, he should have hoped that the House would have accepted it. The House should be left free to consider any reasonable Amendments, so that trades could be selected according to the danger involved. For his part, he should vote against the Instruction.

Mr. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) said the Bill had been placed before the country, and the House had accepted the principle without any demur. He thought that it was too late in the day now to try to limit the scope of the Bill. It was all very well to say leave a trade which was dangerous, but if a man's bread and the bread of his family were depending on it, it became a different matter altogether. He thought they had better not discuss this matter theoretically, but try to look at it from the position of the workers. There were hundreds who would leave these dangerous trades if they could do it, but they could not do it. One of the reasons why these dangerous trades should be included was given by the Colonial Secretary, who spoke of the wounded soldiers of their industrial life. He contended that a man who was injured in the course of his employment had a right to compensation. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept this Instruction. It was not only in chemical works that men were poisoned. There were men working in the mines who were poisoned. Men might be poisoned from bad ventilation, but they would receive no compensation whatever for that injury.

Mr. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) thought that the short discussion of the Bill showed that it was absolutely impossible to limit the action of the Bill if it were to become law. He should therefore support the Instruction. It was becoming clearer every day that to make exceptions would create difficulties.

*Sir JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) thought the Instruction should be a wide Instruction. The Bill was a skeleton Bill, and his conviction was that it was impossible to draw a distinction between trades. ["Hear, hear!"] What was the use of telling a man who was brought up as a coal miner to go elsewhere? How could he go to work elsewhere? The hon. Member for Bow and Bromley said they had had enough of men getting up and saying there was no profit. Employers found means of accomplishing reforms. Although this was a sweeping change, employers desired that it should be fully and fairly worked through all trades, and not applied to three or four only. He hoped the Government would consent to this Instruction.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said it must not be supposed that he and those who sat around him had not as much sympathy for those persons engaged in dangerous trades as hon. Gentlemen opposite. If they voted with the Government on this occasion they would do so on practical and not theoretical grounds. Three claims to the consideration of the House were made by the operatives of the country. There was the claim in respect to accidental injuries and that in respect to employment in a dangerous trade, but he did not see how the third claim could be distinguished from that in regard to dangerous employment. The Instruction provided that injuries to health in the course of employment were also to be considered. That meant that persons were entitled to expect consideration who met with some injury, however trivial, to their health in the course of their employment. [Hon. Members: "Arising out of or in the course of!"] He admitted that the word "or" was significant. In that case the hon. Member would accept the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Liverpool. This Bill was intended to deal with accidental injuries, and, therefore, it was not proper they should be invited to engage in endless discussions upon matters which could not be reasonably remedied under this Measure.

Mr. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): I have listened with very great surprise to some of the speeches which have been delivered from the other side of the House. We are discussing the simple issue whether or not it shall be possible when we come to the Committee stage to include provisions for cases where injury to health as distinguished from injury to limb has resulted from the carrying on of a trade. Everyone who votes against this Instruction will be voting for making it impossible in Committee to include any case, however applicable, of any trade, however dangerous, where it can be shown, as it has been shown, that not only is the percentage of ill-health very grave, but that the results which necessarily follow the pursuit of certain occupations are such as completely to undermine the condition of health. I have a very vivid recollection of what took place in 1893 when I introduced the Government Bill of that year. That Bill contained no clause specifically dealing with dangerous trades, but the hon. Member for Hackney proposed:

> "In any employment injurious to health, in which the risk of injury to health can be mitigated or removed by the use of reasonable precautions, the death, or temporary, or permanent disablement of a workman is caused by the neglect or such reasonable precautions, the workman, or, in case of death, his representatives, shall have the same right to compensation and remedies against the employer as in other cases of personal injury due to negligence."

I did not oppose that Amendment in the first instance, though I was somewhat loth to accept it for this reason, that I thought it was already included in the Bill. Our Bill dealt with all injury by accident—personal injury. In my judgment, that was wide enough to embrace injury against the health of a man through neglect on the part of the employer to take proper precautions, but, as it was pointed out there was some doubt, we accepted the hon. Gentleman's Amendment. That Amendment was blessed from both sides of the House. I think more speeches were made in its favour from the Conservative than from the Liberal Benches, and it is simply the principle of the Amendment that my hon. Friend is now asking the House to empower itself to recognise. I want to know why, if this Measure, as we are told, is so very much larger and more comprehensive n scope than any previously introduced, these not very large in number but very grave and dangerous class of injuries to workmen are to be excluded from the scope of your remedial provisions. Whether you look at the matter from the point of view of prevention or from the point of view of the workmen's title to compensation it appears to me this claim stands on at least as strong a footing as any claim that can be advanced. Surely, from this point of view of prevention, if you make the employer liable for all injuries he will have a strong inducement to diminish the number of injuries. How strongly will this provision operate in the case of trades where prevention is most easy and most necessary! If the employer has this motive he will exercise a better selection of the workpeople he employs, and these are mainly women and children. And if the employers were to exercise more discrimination than they do in the selection of the persons who are employed in these peculiarly dangerous processes a great deal of the ill-health that at present exists might be altogether obviated. Then there are the mechanical processes which could very easily be adopted, and which would mitigate, if not altogether remove, the injurious effects. If that be the case from the point of view of prevention, surely it is stronger from the point of view of the workman's title to compensation. On what principle of common sense are you to say that these people should leave their employment? People go into these dangerous trades not from the love of them, not from a desire for pleasure, not from a desire to secure high wages, for these are the very worst-paid workpeople. These people have to choose between starvation and spending their lives under unwholesome conditions, which necessarily result in injury to health and to a shortening of life. I have not heard a single argument which can suggest to my mind a reason for discriminating between these classes of the soldiers in the industrial army and those who have been so liberally provided for. It is said that this will very greatly extend the scope of the Measure. It will do nothing of the kind. The Home Secretary told us the other night that this Bill would apply to six million people, and those excluded from its scope will amount to seven millions. Let us assume that the Bill will apply to six millions. I believe I am not overstating the number when I say that the whole of the persons in our industrial population who can be affected by any Amendment in pursuance of this Instruction will not exceed 100,000—100,000 in addition to the six millions, or 1 in 60.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich): The whole of the six millions will be affected.

MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Gentleman, like some others, did not seem to realise the limited effect of the words "arising out of and in the course of their employment." There is no intention to compensate workmen who are not engaged in unhealthy trades and who are not exposed to peculiar danger from the character of the employment. I am sure my hon. Friend the Member for Berwickshire, and all of us, will be perfectly ready to consider and adopt any limitation which can be reasonably suggested so as to confine the operation of the subsequent Amendment to those trades which are in real need of special protection. It is said there will be enormous difficulty in determining whether or not the injury to health from which a particular person is suffering had or had not arisen in the course of employment. There will be no greater difficulty than in determining the question whether permanent disablement has resulted from injury. Everyone knows that the shock or the blood-poisoning consequent upon a comparatively slight accident to a limb may permanently disable a man for life. That man would be compensated under this Bill. I earnestly hope the Government may yet be induced to reconsider their decision. The only thing we are asking—and surely it is both a moderate and reasonable request—is that when we get into Committee we shall have the opportunity of considering and discussing Amendments which will secure the same protection for these classes of workers as you are already going to give to all those who are injured by accident in the course of their employment. [*Cheers.*]

SIR J. B. MAPLE thought that the right hon. Gentleman, quite unintentionally, wished to misrepresent the scope of this distinction. He wished to deal with it as though the Bill dealt with the question of dangerous trades, whereas it was a Bill dealing with accidents only. If the Instruction were carried, an employer might be liable for compensation if a man caught a cold through working in a draught, and who said he did not know but what consumption might follow. They understood thoroughly that the Bill now before the House was one to deal with accidents. Every accident would be recorded, and it could be dealt with, but if they were to say that every workman who received any injury to health arising out, or in the course of their employment was to have a claim on the employer, where would they end? It was a difficult subject altogether, and he believed that a separate Bill might be brought in to deal with the dangerous trades. If they were to have the Bill weighted with Amendments which might arise out of the Instruction, they would be discussing the question through August and September. He hoped the Government would stand to the Bill as it had been introduced. He knew it would be a great advantage to the working classes generally, and he would like to see the Bill carried forward. He hoped, therefore, the Instruction would be rejected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Fife said a good deal in the way of minimising the effect of this Instruction, following what has been said by other hon. Members. He pointed out that it was not mandatory and did not commit us to any particular Amendment, but that it was merely to enable us generally to discuss the subject. Then he went on to say that if the House had this power it could confine itself strictly to the case of certain dangerous trades, which he considers include about 100,000 workmen. I ask the House, as practical people, not to open the floodgates of discussion—[*cheers*]—even upon an enabling Instruction until they know where it will carry them. I am bound to say I think it will carry us a great deal further than my right hon. Friend opposite appears to think. ["Hear, hear!"] The right hon. Gentleman argued from analogy. We shall have, no doubt, again and again, in the course of these Debates, the same appeal to logic, to our inability to discriminate between different cases of persons who have a claim to the compensation which this Bill affords. That is perfectly true, but, as I ventured to point out on the Second Reading, if we are to be guided by logic to that extent, after we have already introduced a Bill which is admitted to be one of the most important Bills that have been brought before the House in the last few years, which is admitted to be a revolutionary Bill, and to introduce new principles into our industrial life—if we are, on the ground of logic, to be continually applying to that Bill new structures, the Bill itself will certainly not get through the present Session. [*Cheers.*] I really sympathise very much with a great deal that has been said on the other side, and I feel all the more sympathy because I am quite certain that my right hon. Friend and other hon. Members who have spoken are merely interested in the cases they submitted to the House, and in the hardships which they revealed, and that their arguments did not include any calculations which are hostile to the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] My right hon. Friend says the Instruction is intended to apply only to dangerous trades. Then it is very badly drawn. ["Hear, hear!"] The Instruction applies to a great deal more than that. ["Hear, hear!"] It is not limited at all to the extent of the proposals which the right hon. Gentleman accepted in 1893, and with the acceptance of which he now apparently taunts Gentlemen on this side of the House. The Instruction will allow the Committee to discuss any Amendment intended to give compensation for any injury to health, whether caused by negligence or not, happening to any person "in the course and arising out of that employment." Those are the vaguest possible words. I will undertake to say that under those words it would be perfectly legitimate to claim compensation for a person of whom it was alleged that he had become consumptive in consequence of working in a draught. ["Hear, hear!"] That is not, I am sure, an extreme impossibility, and when my right hon. Friend opposite says, "Oh! but we can assure you that all we ask is that you should give to these people in the lead trade and certain other trades the compensation which we demand, and that we will not attempt to apply it to other less dangerous trades," then, I ask, where is his logic? How has he suddenly developed this power of discrimination? Will any man tell me what difference there is in logic between the agricultural labourer who contracts rheumatism in the course of his employment and the person working in a lead factory who contracts disease in the course of his employment? [*Cheers.*] I defy anybody logically to show the slightest distinction between those two cases. My right hon. Friend does not agree with me—

MR. ASQUITH: I do agree.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Well, then, my right hon. Friend agrees, and yet he has not put in a claim for the agricultural labourer. [*Cheers.*] And, moreover, not only that—he has declared that so far as he is concerned, he will distinctly exclude him. I only appeal to that to show that even my right hon. Friend, slave to logic as he is—[*laughter*]—is unable to carry out this view in its application to this Bill, and it points very clearly to the difficulty in which this House will find itself if we are to allow the scope of the Bill, already so large, to be continually increased in pursuit of this illusory phantom of logic. [*Cheers.*] I say undoubtedly a distinction could be made between the pressing and urgent claims of the dangerous trades, and the claims of the bulk of the trades of this country, in all of which, however, it is quite possible that an injury to health might occur in consequence of and arising out of the employment; and the Instruction practically amounts to this, that, having got a Bill which imposes a new liability upon employers and upon trade, this proposal takes a perfectly different line and proposes to impose a further liability. It is not a question of distinguishing between different trades; it is a question of distinguishing between different liabilities; and, admitting, for the sake of argument, that the new liability which you seek to impose will be a fair liability, I say it is altogether too large to be imposed in this Bill. [*Cheers.*] If it is to be imposed at all, let us treat it as a separate question—[*cheers*]—and then it will be found how extremely complicated and difficult it will be. ["Hear, hear!"] It is difficult sometimes, no doubt, to prevent malingering in the case of what the law admits to be an accident, but it would be almost impossible to deal with the question of malingering when it comes to injury to health; and when a person who is injured has to prove, as he would have had to prove according to the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the injury to health was due to the neglect of what is called reasonable precaution, I think you would have opened the way to an amount of litigation to which even the Employers' Liability Act can show no parallel. [*Cheers.*] But let me put one more point to the House. In the case of the dangerous trades themselves, what is it you are going to do? In the case of an ordinary trade it may be that the injury to health occurs so seldom that the liability would not be a very large one, but in the case of these dangerous trades it is contended that the number of cases is very considerable in proportion to the workpeople employed. And you are going to throw this new liability in these cases upon the trades which, by your own statement, are the worst-paid trades in the country. Consider what you are doing. If they are the worst-paid trades in the country, being dangerous trades, it must be because the trade is unprofitable. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] That is absolutely certain. Are there no such things as trade unions? Is it possible that in these trades the trade unions are powerless?

*MR. BURNS: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: That is the most extraordinary thing I have ever heard. [*Cheers.*] To say that in trades of this kind, which offer no attraction to the workman, from which the ordinary workman would naturally shrink unless he had some great advantage offered to him, even at a time when they can offer to pay higher wages, the workmen do not get higher wages, is to say what my experience does not justify. ["Hear, hear!"] I say that in a trade of this kind the wages would be higher if that trade could afford it. There are other dangerous trades in which the wages are higher precisely because the trade is dangerous, but in which the competition is so great that they cannot afford an increase in the wages. If they are in that position, then, if you are going to throw upon them this new and increased liability, you are going to destroy the trade. For my own part, I have often thought it was a matter which might be open to argument whether a trade which does involve so much suffering as some of these trades are alleged to do, is a trade that ought to be carried on at all—["hear, hear!"]—but let it be borne in mind that, if you propose to throw this new liability upon these particular trades, what you propose is to destroy those trades, and that can be the only effect of the action you propose. I do not want to lay stress upon that. I am only indicating to the House the number, the importance, and the complexity of the questions which would be raised if we open out this discussion, and under the circumstances I cannot help thinking that the Bill is already of such a character, of such dimensions, and of such importance that it will well occupy the time of the House during the remainder of the Session, and I hope its future progress will not be endangered by increasing its present scope. [*Cheers.*]

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that, looking to the fact that this was the most tremendous experiment in Socialism ever offered to the House by a Conservative Government, it seemed to him they ought to make the experiment handsomely. [*Opposition laughter and cheers.*] It was absolutely impossible for any man who was in harmony with the spirit of this Bill to vote against the Instruction. [*Opposition cheers.*] The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Liverpool cut away the ground from the Instruction. It was not a question whether or not the employer had neglected his duty. The element of neglect which the Amendment proposed to introduce was quite outside the principle of the Bill. The House ought to come to the consideration of this Bill with unfettered hands. They ought to be able to deal with maladies arising from dangerous trades as well as with accidents, and this Instruction would enable them to do that. His opinion was that the Bill must be extended to all trades and all occasions—[*Opposition cheers*]—and everybody who accepted the principle of the Bill was bound to accept the Instruction moved by the hon. Gentleman opposite. ["Hear, hear!"] He, therefore, should vote against the Amendment and for the Instruction.

SIR A. FORWOOD asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HUDSON KEARLEY (Devonport) said he wished to ask a question as to the bearing of the Bill in the case of certain Government employés, he meant a body of men who were employed to do what was called double bottom work. The work was so dangerous that the instructions were that no man should be engaged on this work for more than two hours a day, and not more than two days a week. He wanted to know whether, in the event of a Government employé losing his life while employed on this double bottom work, his representatives would get compensation under this Bill without this Instruction being adopted.

Mr. P. A. MUNTZ (Warwickshire, Tamworth) said he wished to say at the outset that he did not approve of the Bill as it stood. He did not approve of throwing the liability for accidents on the employer. He thought it should be thrown on a national insurance fund. ["Hear, hear!"] But with regard to the Instruction, he thought it was really absurd to argue that it would not increase the scope of the Bill to any practical extent. It must be perfectly apparent from its wording that it would enormously increase the scope of the Bill if it was carried in its present form. He should certainly vote against the Instruction, but at the same time he thought it was only fair and right that he should say that he did not approve of the Bill at all. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) pointed out that there were at the present time schedules existing of dangerous trades, and he was quite certain that his hon. Friend who moved the Instruction would be perfectly willing to limit its scope to those trades now scheduled as dangerous trades. He submitted that a strong case had been made out in favour of the Instruction and on its merits, when limited to those trades scheduled as dangerous, there could not be two opinions. ["Hear, hear!"]

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that there must be a limit to the charges falling upon a business. While, perhaps, twopence a ton might be put on in the coal business without ruining it, if every trade practically was included the difficulty of working the Bill would be vastly increased. More than that, he did not believe that it would be possible to increase the scope of the Bill if it was to pass this Session, and, therefore, he should vote against the Instruction.

Question proposed, "That those words be added."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 144; Noes, 233.—(Division List, No. 215.)

Bill considered in Committee.

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

LIABILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO WORKMEN FOR INJURIES.

(1.) If in any employment to which this Act applies personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act.

(2.) Provided that:—

(*a*) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed;

(*b*) When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act, except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

(3.) If any question arises as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies, or whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer, or of any person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, or whether the injury was caused by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment of the workman injured, or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, or otherwise as to the liability for compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement, shall, subject to the provisions of the first schedule to this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the second schedule to this Act.

(4.) If the Registrar of Friendly Societies certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment is on the whole not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of this Act, the employer may, until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of those workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act, and thereupon the employer shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme, but, save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act.

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON (Preston) moved, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again," but the Chairman of Ways and Means being of opinion that the Motion was an abuse of the Rules of the House, declined to propose the Question thereupon to the Committee.

Mr. T. W. NUSSEY (Pontefract) moved in Sub-section (1) to leave out the words "to which this Act applies," and to insert the words "in which a workman (as hereinafter defined) is engaged." He stated that he wished to refer the Committee to the definition of "a workman" adopted in Clause 2 of the Bill. He proposed to adopt what was, practically speaking, the same definition as that contained in the Act of 1880. The effect of these words was to extend the scope of the Bill and make it practically a universal Bill, to include all classes of trade and employment with the exception of domestic and menial servants. He reminded the House that the Home Secretary laid special stress on the point that domestics and menials ought not to be included in the Act, as persons employing one or two servants might be ruined by the payment of compensation, owing to the wanton carelessness of a housemaid. Perhaps some exception might be taken to his Amendment on the ground that it excluded certain classes of people from the benefits of the Act whose position could not logically be distinguished from those actually engaged in manual labour. He referred to omnibus conductors, goods guards, and others, whose main work was not manual labour. But he would point out that the words of the Bill itself covered such cases. The definition clause said "whether by manual labour or otherwise," and the word "otherwise" covered all such cases. Having explained that his Amendment was intended to include seamen, the hon. Member said it might be objected that it opened too wide a field, but it was open to those who thought so to show, by argument, why any special trade or class of workmen should be excluded, and they could limit the Act by taking out one trade after another if any radical reason could be found why they should not share in the blessings which the Act was to bring on their fellow workers. He urged that they could not be too careful in defining what was meant by the Bill. Different County Court Judges might have different opinions, and unless they were very careful and explicit, these differences of opinion were bound to form one of the greatest difficulties in the working of the Act. They ought to give the Judges some words to guide them; and it was for that reason he had introduced the words of the Act of 1880, because they were well-known and well-tried words. To appreciate the whole meaning of the words they must turn to Clause 2, and they found that it included five trades—railways, factories, mines, quarries, and engineering. He complained that some of the definitions inserted in the first clause were very stupid, besides being complicated. The word "factory" was included, and there was a definition of the word. Many arguments for the inclusion of factories had been based on the fact that they were in the main wealthy trades. Some hon. Gentlemen, indeed, seemed to be under the impression that all factory owners and mill owners were rich men. This was far from the case. There were many factories which came under the Factories and Workshops Act that were carried on by the proprietors who were extremely small men and often very poor, and very little removed in position from the class of men whom they employed. Then under the Bill as it stood there would probably be conflicting decisions as to the meaning of the term "factory," and he understood that from the County Court Judges who would give those decisions there would be no appeal. Thus there would be none of that uniformity which was so essential in legal administration. For example, in Leeds, Bradford, and Huddersfield there were different County

Court Judges, and there might be possibly similar accidents in these three towns. The Judges, however, might give absolutely different decisions, so that the same circumstances would not have the same results. In engineering work, as referred to in the Bill, sewers would be included, but the word sewer did not include a drain under the Public Health Act of 1875. A man who met with an accident in a drain would consequently have no claim to compensation, whereas the man who worked in an open sewer would be entitled to benefit under the Bill. Such anomalies were bound to cause friction and ill-feeling in the future, and the various restrictions to the operation of the Measure were certain to cause great differences between class and class, trade and trade, employer and employed. The Bill did not fulfil the pledges of the Members of the Government at the General Election, when the people were told that there was to be universal compensation for all accidents. On February 20, 1893, the present Secretary for the Colonies said:—

> "I beg the House to consider whether it is worth while to deal with this subject in a partial way, and whether it would not be possible once and for all to settle the right of every workman to compensation."

The right hon. Gentleman added:—

> "This compensation would not be a very serious matter for trade. You could do it at a very small cost."

On what grounds had certain trades been selected? One ground was that the Bill would throw a burden on employers, and that therefore it was desirable to select rich trades. In these trades, however, there were many poor employers who were in no sense better able to bear the burden of this legislation than shipowners or farmers who were excluded. Another reason assigned for the selection which had been made was that the trades in question were trades in which the proportion of accidents occurring was exceptionally high. But he was not sure that that was the case. The mere fact that there had already been legislative interference with these trades did not prove that those engaged in them were subject to an extraordinary number of accidents. He held that if the principle upon which this Bill was founded was sound there was no justification for excluding certain trades from its scope. In its present form it would place workmen in the selected trades in an extremely advantageous position as compared with other workmen and so it would violate the accepted principle that before the law all men were equal and of equal status. One of the arguments against the proposal to extend the operation of the Bill to other trades was that such extension would result in the bankruptcy of poor employers. For his part he did not believe that any such disastrous consequences would ensue. Similar fears were expressed in connection with previous factory legislation, and they had proved to be groundless. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

MR. H. SETON-KARR (St. Helens), who seconded the Amendment, said that its real object was that the Bill should not be limited in its application, but should be made universal. This was one of the most important considerations to which the Committee could devote itself. He might mention that he had placed an Amendment upon the Paper, providing that if the present proposal were carried the words "not included in the third schedule to this Act" should be inserted. A third schedule could then be added, containing the few special trades which it might be desirable on exceptional grounds to exclude from the operation of the Bill. This would be a convenient course, for it would give hon. Members an opportunity of stating fully the special measures for excepting any particular trade from the Bill. It seemed to him that the general principle of the Amendment was that the Bill should be universal in its application, and not specifically limited to certain specified trades. What were the reasons given by the two Ministers of the Crown for limiting the operation of the Bill? It was said that by extending the scope of the Bill they would be taking up too much of the time of the Session. But when dealing with such an important subject as this they ought to recognise that it was necessary to make a good Bill, and should not, therefore, grudge the time required for it. This was not a petty Bill dealing with some minor point. It dealt with millions of invested capital, and with millions of working men, and they ought to make a logical and good Bill. Were they to be told to throw logic overboard in order that they might pass the Bill quickly? He ventured to think that unless the Bill could stand on its own merits and could be made a really good all-round Bill, it had much better not be passed at all. He thought their object should be to make it a good and a logical Bill. The Home Secretary had told them that they were bound to proceed in a tentative fashion, and apply the Bill in the first place to the most dangerous trades. The right hon. Gentleman frankly admitted that this was not a logical thing to do. In that remark he absolutely and entirely agreed. He should like to point out that the trades in which the most accidents happened were the trades in which the largest amount of compensation had to be paid. They were proposing to put a burden on those trades which it was most difficult to ascertain, and against which it was most difficult to insure. If, therefore, it was fair and equitable to apply the principle of this Bill to the dangerous trades *a fortiori*, it was fair and equitable to apply it to non-dangerous trades where the tax imposed upon the industry itself was limited in amount, where it could be most easily ascertained, and so insured against. If this was a question of caution, and they were to apply the Bill tentatively, he thought they ought not to begin with most dangerous trades, but with those in which the compensation was highest. The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary devoted a large part of his speech to pointing out the reason why the Bill should be limited in its application, and stated that the Government were following the example of the Factory Act of Lord Shaftesbury in gradually applying this Bill. He ventured to point out there was all the distinction in the world between this Bill and the factory legislation which Lord Shaftesbury initiated. Lord Shaftesbury's legislation was preventive and re medial, intended to shorten the hours of children in mines, and to enforce conditions of health and safety. Those remedies had to be applied tentatively to the different trades according to the differing conditions of those trades. But this Bill, he submitted, was absolutely and entirely different. It was a money compensation Bill; it was a Bill which provided for money compensation in various limited trades. He contended that the principle of a money compensation Bill was equally applicable to every trade. It was only a question of the burden of compensation in each particular trade. If this money compensation principle was applicable to dangerous trades, then it seemed to him still more applicable to trades which were not so dangerous, and in which the burden of compensation would not be so great. He ventured to remind the House that this Bill proposed to relieve the ratepayers in this country at the expense of the employers or of the industry itself. At present the cost of compensating injured workmen, if not met in the case of unavoidable accidents by the friendly societies to which both the employers and employed subscribed, fell upon the rates. By this Bill the friendly societies and the ratepayers were practically relieved from their liability. Thus the employers in the included trades were not only liable to their own workmen for all accidents, but were liable as ratepayers to the rates for compensation for unavoidable accidents in trades which were not included. He was absolutely unable to see how anybody could defend that principle. The included trades paid in two capacities. They paid as employers in their own particular industries, and they paid as ratepayers. But the non-included trades paid in one capacity only, namely, as ratepayers. A Bill of this kind ought to contain pecuniary relief in which all trades generally must share, otherwise a most serious injustice would be done. Under any circumstances it seemed to him it was perfectly certain that the most dangerous trade would have to bear the heaviest burden of compensation. He wanted to know why the most dangerous trades should be the pioneers in this most revolutionary and important movement. The Colonial Secretary advocated the limitation of the Bill on the ground of expediency. He had told them that if the Bill was applied to all trades without exception, it would arouse so much opposition that it would be impossible to carry the Measure. He was himself unable to understand that argument. Where was the opposition to come from? It seemed to him that the Bill must stand or fall upon its own merits. As a matter of fact the Government had a majority of 150 behind them. They believed in the principle of the Bill—and he himself was most heartily in support of the principle of general compensation—and if they had a majority who believed in the principle of the Bill, and it was demonstrated to them that it would not impose inequitable burdens of compensation upon any particular trade, then he wanted to know who was going to oppose it? The right hon. Gentleman had said that this was a Bill for giving relief to injured men, and what hon. Member, if he believed the Bill was going to bring relief to injured workmen, would vote against such a desirable object? The Home Secretary had stated that there were 13,000,000 wage earners in the country, and the Bill only applied to 6,000,000. Who was going to take the responsibility of denying relief to the other 7,000,000, unless it could be shown that in some particular cases the burden of compensation imposed on any industry was inequitable and unjust? The two largest interests which were excluded were the shipping and the agricultural industries. Were hon. Members representing those industries to be asked to support the Bill on the ground that it did not apply to their constituents engaged in those industries, who would not, therefore, have to share in the burden imposed. If so he ventured to think the proposal was unjust and inequitable. There was besides the consideration that these men would be voting to relieve themselves as ratepayers without giving any adequate compensation for that relief. He submitted that if this Bill was a wise and beneficent reform for giving relief to injured workmen it ought at all events to be general in principle and universal in its application. With regard to the general compensation scheme he believed that part of the Bill was most excellent in principle, and he only desired to see it carried out universally. Let all stand on the same ground and be tarred with the same brush. [*Cheers.*] He seconded the Amendment because he felt that the Bill should be made general and universal in its application, otherwise it would inflict a serious injustice on some industries.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that, important as was the principle raised by this Amendment, a good many Second Reading speeches had been delivered already on the same point. While, therefore, recognising the importance of the Amendment, and the strength of the feeling which animated the last speaker, he could not refrain from remarking that, while apparently his hon. Friend was blessing the Bill, he was doing his best to injure it, to impede, if not to prevent, its passing. The same remark might apply to this Amendment. Both hon. Gentleman stated that a very good principle of compensation had been embodied in the Bill, and they asked that, if the principle was sound, why not extend it? But to that proposition he replied that, however excellent the ideal, they must in politics try to aim at what was practicable, and they ought to take care not to overload the proposals by attempting too great a scheme, thereby failing altogether. The Government had drawn no arbitrary distinction between the industries included and those which were excluded. They were not prepared to accept the universal application of the Bill, and the Government would look upon any Amendment to that effect as having a fatal influence upon it. They were not, however, indisposed to discuss, when the clause defining the industries to which the Bill applied was reached, how far the particular definitions were inadequate; whether, for example, the definitions of the building trade ought not to include buildings 30ft. high, a point which had been mentioned by the Colonial Secretary. He hoped the Committee would soon settle the general principle as to whether there should or should not be certain exclusions. The Government believed that the principle which they had adopted was a sounder one than to insert the whole of the workmen of the country in the Bill in the first instance, and then on the schedule to have long discussions as to whether a particular industry should or should not be excluded. They had included in the Bill practically all of what were known as the dangerous trades. In the first instance the Bill must be in its nature an experimental Measure, the importance of which could not be exaggerated. He trusted that the Committee would support the Government in retaining the words as indicating the principle on which the Bill ought to be applied.

MR. HENRY BROADHURST (Leicester) looked on the speech of the hon. Member for St. Helen's (Mr. Seton-Karr) with the gravest suspicion as an indication of friendliness towards the Bill. He and his hon. Friends looked upon the Bill with such favour that it would be impossible for them to sit still and make no attempt to extend it to all the trades of the country. Could the Home Secretary give an assurance that two or three additional industries would be added to the Bill? Take the building trade. Accidents here were not so numerous as in mines, railways, and engineering works; but this, in his judgment, was an additional argument in favour of including this trade, because its inclusion would not mean a very great widening of the experiment which the Government were making. He regretted that the Government had not included in the Bill a class who had no means whatever of making provision against accidents—agricultural labourers. ["Hear, hear!"] He lived among agricultural labourers, and had known them all his life, and he knew the suffering that accidents caused during harvest time. They and their families had nothing before them but starvation, misery, or the workhouse. In his own trade he calculated that they had paid over £117,000 for accidents. The carpenters and joiners had paid £37,000. Yet these trades had not been ruined, and hon. Members need not be alarmed as to the injury that would be inflicted on any trade or industry by the Bill. The scheme could not rest where it was. It was inevitable that the State would come in and take the responsibility. The State was to a large extent the guardian of the general community, and it must provide protection for the community under certain conditions. He pressed the Government to tell the Committee what industries at present excluded from the Bill would be included in it. If they would do this it would shorten Debate, and the Bill could easily be passed through Committee this week.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said it would probably be perfectly right that agricultural labourers and the building trade should be included in the Bill, but it was a cardinal rule that when legislation was applied to particular classes it should not be applied behind their backs. The farmers and master builders had practically had no notice that their inclusion in this Bill would be suggested.

MR. S. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow) agreed that if the Home Secretary would state what trades he would or would not include in the Bill the Debate would be much shortened. As to industries not having notice of their inclusion in the Bill, that applied all round. No one had the remotest idea what industries the Bill would affect until it was introduced.

MR. J. M. MACLEAN (Cardiff) said it was remarkable that every speech on the Amendment had been in favour of extending the principle of the Bill to other trades than those included in it. The Home Secretary himself did not repudiate that idea. At the last election the principle of general compensation provided by the State, and not by the employers, was generally put forward by Members of the Unionist Party. It was unfair and invidious to select particular trades and levy upon them a particular tax intended not for the welfare of those trades, but simply for the good of the community. When the community laid such a burden upon any trade it should provide compensation. He had put down an Amendment intended to call attention to the effect of this Bill on the coal trade, the trade which would suffer principally by the Bill. Employers in the textile industries informed him that the Bill would not impose any special burden on them. Those industries were not liable to the disasters that happened in the coal-mining industry, and which it was impossible for employers even with the greatest care and attention to avoid. Whenever an explosion entailing loss of life or serious injuries took place the community at large recognised the fact that the burden of providing for the victims should not rest with the employers, and invariably a public subscription was raised. This Bill said that the employers alone were to suffer by accidents of that kind. That imposed a serious burden on the employers. It had been estimated at 3d. a ton on the total output. It might be disputed whether this would fall on the coalowners or the workmen. But whichever it fell upon it was evident that under this Bill the trade would have to pay for it. He was much astonished to hear from the lips of the Colonial Secretary the argument that 3d. a ton was not very much to lay on the coal trade because the price of coal went up a few shillings every now and then. But the price of coal varied owing to general causes which affected the coal trade not only of this country but other countries as well, and an extra 3d. on coal would make it still more difficult for the export coal trade of this country to compete with its foreign rivals. Nothing was more remarkable than the great transformation which had taken place in recent years in the way business was conducted in this country, the elimination of the private employer and the conversion of business concerns into limited companies. A man who had had a property of that sort might take up any new career he liked; he might become a politician and even a statesman, and then, to show his benevolence to the working classes, he might lay burdens on the ordinary shareholders whom he had left in his business and from which he would be perfectly free. [*Laughter.*] The difficulty they had to meet was to know who were actually carrying on the business of the country. The only way to get at these men was to call in the agency of the State and to ask the State to sweep them into its net and force them to contribute towards the efficient carrying on of business in which they were practically engaged. It seemed clear that the Conservative Party, by the novel and daring experiment which they were carrying out, were attempting to put in force for the first time the famous principle of "ransom." [*Laughter.*] They had all been converted now. That which they formerly denounced they now embraced. There was a great deal to be said for "ransom" as originally propounded. It attacked the idle rich—those who "toil not neither do they spin." [*Laughter.*] Now they had changed all that, for they were going to lay the burden merely on the captains of industry. [*Cheers.*] If they were to be Socialists let them be Socialists all round, dividing the burdens equally and distributing amongst all trades in the country any benefits that were to be obtained from the adoption of these new principles. ["Hear, hear!"]

On the return of the Chairman of Ways and Means, after the usual interval,

Mr. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he represented a constituency which was for the most part composed of workmen for whom the question of compensation for accidents sustained in the course of employment was the one test question. Yet most of those men were excluded from any benefit under the Bill. They were the victims of the doctrine of common employment—a doctrine which was condemned by the common sense and the sense of justice of every one who had given it consideration. An employer of those men could escape from responsibility for an accident by showing that the accident was the result, not of his negligence or the negligence of any of his workmen, but of the negligence of some sub-contractor—it might be a man of straw—whom he had employed to do his own work. It did seem really shocking that a Bill to amend the law of employers' liability should leave the law as to any particular trade, let alone as to every trade but five, open to such an injustice. Therefore, however much Members might approve of the Bill so far as the trades affected by it were concerned, however heartily they might congratulate the Government on the adoption of a principle by which he believed one of the most difficult of social problems could be solved, how could they who felt earnest about the matter, who felt that they were the representatives of the workmen who were excluded from the operation of the Bill, justify their action if they were to accept it in its present limited scope? It was their duty towards the men who were excluded from the Bill to urge that it was their right either to be brought within the scope of the Bill or to have the ordinary law so altered that the injustice under which they suffered might be done away with. In regard to the case of seamen, he would not say that the law should in respect to them remain unaltered; but he did say that their case could not be treated as identical in any way with the case of men employed on land. Holding those opinions, he would support the Amendment.

Mr. W. J. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said that credit had been claimed by hon. Gentlemen opposite for the

Second Reading of the Bill having been obtained without a Division, but he thought the credit, if any, was due to those employers of labour who had accepted a new, very large, and grave responsibility without challenging a Division. During the Debates on the Bill no logical reason had been given for the exclusion of any trades. ["Hear, hear!"] It was a preposterous doctrine to ask employers of one particular class of labour to be responsible for all and every accident, and at the same time not to put a similar responsibility upon employers in every other trade. ["Hear, hear!"] While he did not agree with the proposal of the hon. Member to insert the particular words of the Amendment, he certainly agreed that it was necessary that the Bill should be applied to all trades, and he would vote for leaving out the words, "to which this Act applies." The Home Secretary's argument about what would have been said had the Bill applied only to the less dangerous trades was most extraordinary. Surely, if Members representing large commercial constituencies had a right, which the Home Secretary admitted, to have their constituents included, the agricultural Members had exactly the same right. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped the Government, before it was too late, would reconsider their decision. He hoped that they would not have either at bye-elections or at the next General Election, Members going simply to get their particular constituents included in the Bill, but that the Government would allow their supporters to defend the Bill, on the ground that all working men were treated by a Conservative Government on an equal footing. The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Chamberlain) had raised the question of expediency, but his illustrations as to the franchise and the income tax not being logical in their application were very unfortunate, because, whether logical or not, both applied to everyone alike, and the whole community was at least treated on an equality. It was true that as to seamen and as to the Factory Acts Parliament had proceeded separately, but those were entirely different cases. They provided by these Acts that the health, safety, and conditions of labour should be regulated according to the necessities of each trade, but they did not provide that one class of workmen should be treated better than another. The Bill included the most dangerous trades. Why should less dangerous ones be left out, especially when, the danger being smaller, the change in the condition of these trades would be less? The Bill, as a whole, had his entire approval so far as it applied to compensation for accidents, but he did not think that the way the compensation was to be provided was entirely satisfactory, and it would be much less satisfactory unless all trades were included. Perhaps it was too much to expect the Government to recede from their position, but he would not cease to raise his voice on every opportunity to have all classes of working men receive the same benefit. ["Hear, hear!"] He could only hope that the Government would recede from their position, and, so far as he was concerned, he should raise his voice in favour of giving to all sections of the working classes the same privileges. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said he could not help thinking that the Amendment ought to be accepted. It did not go so far as several of the Amendments that followed on the Paper, but it opened the way to include in the Bill several of those large industries which had a claim to be included—a greater claim, he thought, to be included even than those already in the Bill. He had had a good deal of experience of some of these industries—the dangerous industries—but many of the dangerous industries were already provided for to a very large extent by their own provident societies. In the coal industry, for instance, with which he was most familiar, according to the last Returns there were 141,775 men employed, and of these, to their great credit, 122,000 were enrolled in the Miners' Provident Society. To the widows of men who had been killed £52,000 odd was paid last year, and £34,000 was disbursed as compensation for accidents, to say nothing of payments made to aged members, which had nothing to do with this Bill. That £86,000 was subscribed almost entirely —within 6 per cent.—by the men themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] The Government proposed to include that industry in the Bill, and yet they were leaving out of its scope a number of industries, the members of which were, in many cases, unable to provide for themselves. It seemed to him there was no logic in the system whatever. ["Hear, hear!"] The Government were going to take in those who were already fairly provided for, by their own forethought and industry, and they were going to leave out those who, through being so widely scattered or for other reasons, were unable to form trade unions, such as the agricultural labourers and others, who were about three or four times the number of those employed in mines. The death rate amongst seamen was frightfully high, but no provision was made for them in the Bill. The fishing industry, which employed something like 25,000 or 30,000 men, was also left out, and whilst men employed on the railways were included. Road carriers were being entirely ignored. Legislation of this kind if promoted at all should be done completely, thoroughly, and well.

SIR ARTHUR FORWOOD did not think the words of the hon. Member were applicable to the Bill. The Bill was spoken of as "petty legislation." He did not think any Bill which dealt with six or seven millions of people could be properly described as "petty." They were told that if this Amendment was adopted it would be fatal to the Bill. As practical men, they must accept that statement, and he did not intend, at that stage, to do more than protest that more classes of workmen were not included in the Bill. But he was not one of those who would jeopardise the Bill on that account. He regretted that seamen were not included in the Bill. As a shipowner, he should be glad to see seamen included in the Bill. He did not see why a man who met with an accident whilst driving a plough or a traction engine should not be compensated. There was no more dangerous occupation than the loading or unloading of vessels, and yet those engaged in it were precluded from the benefits this Bill gave. In view, however, of the statement of the Home Secretary, he should vote against the Amendment.

MR. FREDERICK CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) said that while hailing the Bill with pleasure, he regretted that the Government did not propose to treat all trades alike. The excuse for making invidious exceptions would hardly hold water, for, as the hon. Baronet the Member for Durham had pointed out, most if not all the trades included in this Bill had relief societies connected with them, and were thus to some extent already provided for. It was said the Amendment would operate hardly on the small employer, but there could be no doubt the Bill would eventually lead to the insuring of all workmen within its scope, and so far as he could see there was no greater hardship in insuring a small number of men than in insuring a large number. As a matter of fact the small employer would get his men insured at a considerably less premium than certain people engaged in more dangerous trades. The agricultural labourer was not to receive the benefits of the Bill, but for the life of him he could not see the difference between a man getting a hand hurt in a machine in his works or getting a hand hurt in a turnip pulping machine in the country. It seemed absurd that a man working in a factory in town, and getting, say, 30s. to £3 a week in wages, should be compensated for an accident, whilst a poor agricultural labourer, earning only 11s. a week, and whose only hope, if crippled, was to end his days in the workhouse, should be turned adrift without any compensation whatever. The Secretary for the Colonies once said that the agricultural labourer was the most pathetic figure in our whole social system. The right hon. Gentleman described him as condemned by apparently "inexorable" conditions to a life of "unremitting and hopeless toil," with the prospect of the poor-house as its only or probable termination. He further stated that the agricultural labourer had been "ignored, oppressed, and defrauded" for generations. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would admit that, if the agricultural labourer was not being oppressed or defrauded now, he was certainly being ignored. He was not aware that the condition of the agricultural labourer had much changed, except that he was able to buy some of the necessaries of life much cheaper. He hoped the House would consider whether such a man ought to be excluded from any Bill brought in for the benefit of the working classes. During the discussion on the Agricultural Rating Bill of last year they heard a great deal from hon. Gentlemen opposite about stopping the influx of labourers from the country into the towns. He himself thought it was very desirable that, if possible, that influx should be stopped, and he asked hon. Members opposite to consider whether the best way of obtaining that object was by making the conditions of labour so much better in the factory than they were on the farm. In the one case a man was to be compensated for any injury he might sustain in the course of his employment; in the other he was to be turned adrift without it. In his opinion such a policy could not be defended, and he held that employers of labour who would be affected by the Bill had a right to demand that these invidious distinctions should not be made.

*COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon) said that many hon. Members who had joined in the Debate, did not seem to understand how the matter stood with regard to the smaller trades. As a matter of fact, many of the smaller trades were carried on in workshops which were now under the Workshops Acts. He was quite certain, that if they really meant to work the Bill, they must draw the line where it was proposed to be drawn, or else accept the offer of the Government merely to insert certain other trades by name. In the Midlands, trades were carried on in little workshops. A gun for instance, was not made in one manufactory in Birmingham. The barrel was made in one workshop, the stock in another, and so forth. Locks, saddlery and needles were largely made in small workshops. Almost the whole of the North Worcestershire nail and chain industry was conducted in small workshops in which the master was little better off than the man. They would find a father, mother and child, and, perhaps, one journeyman working together, and very often the master could not pay his men on the Friday or Saturday until he had collected the money from the manufacturers for whom he worked. It would really be absurd to suddenly throw upon the master in such a case a liability to pay down in a lump sum from £100 to £300, or 10s., 12s. 6d. or 15s. a week for life. This was a great measure with a very great principle underlying it. It could not stop here, but it must begin here. If they intended to cast at once their net over the whole of the working people, the Act would die of its own weight. [HON. MEMBERS: "Why?"] Because the smaller man could not bear a life-long liability. He felt that the time was not far distant when the smaller people would be brought under the Bill, but they could not be brought under it until it had been assimilated by the country, and a system of insurance, national, local, or by trades, had been formulated.

MR. BURNS said that what they wanted was an authoritative statement from the Home Secretary as to where this Bill did apply and where it did not apply. If the right hon. Gentleman would do that, he would probably save two or three days' discussion; if he declined, he was afraid encouragement would be given to move Amendments, not with the object of wrecking the Bill, but with the legitimate and *bonâ fide* intention of improving it as far as that could possibly be done. The hon. Member had referred to the nail and chain industries of Cradley Heath, but surely he did not wish to impose upon those industries further disabilities and further injustices which, in other directions, they had suffered so long. The men, women, and children there were working under absolutely intolerable conditions of hard labour, long hours, insanitary conditions, and brutally low wages. And was that penalty to be supplemented by the further penalty that if a boy or man was injured while working in a shop where steam was not used, he was to get no compensation at all? Let them grapple with the small master at once. ["Hear, hear!"] Why should the Committee give to the small master, who very frequently was a greedy and ignorant and unscrupulous person, immunity from protective legislation in industry which was imposed upon a large master? ["Hear, hear!"] He could understand the argument that it was for his preservation, but he would point out that the master's preservation meant the death of, or injury to, the workmen who were not protected. The risk of the small master was proportionate to his business. Very frequently he engaged personally in the trade, and was able to take minute care in the workshop. This would quicken his sense of protection to his workmen and stimulate him to improve the conditions under which they worked. If it did not do that, it would drive him to insure the same as the large master, and he saw no reason why the small master should be exempted from that condition. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Baronet for the Ormskirk Division said that all trades in which machinery other than that worked by hand labour was employed should be included in the Bill. If he would move that he would vote with him with pleasure. The hon. Baronet went on to mention an industry in which machines were not used which was not in the Bill, but which he thought ought to come within its scope—namely, the unloading by stevedores and dockers of ships in mid-stream. They would not come within the scope of the Bill at all.

Sir A. FORWOOD: I said I would vote in favour of their being included in the Bill.

Mr. BURNS said that, unfortunately for those workers, the hon. Baronet was not the Home Secretary, and he wanted to get the view of the Home Secretary on that particular point. Were trades that employed machinery other than that worked by hand labour to have this Bill applied to them? If so, let it be said so that night. He also wanted to know a little more distinctly than he did at present why seamen had been excluded. What were they going to do with seamen who were actually engaged in sailoring occupations, but whose vessel was alongside a wharf or a dock or in mid-stream? ["Hear, hear!"] Were they going to treat a vessel when it was not at sea or not in actual motion as a factory or workshop within the scope of the Bill? They were told that this Bill, being experimental in its character, should be limited in its scope. That was invariably the excuse of people who had not altogether made up their minds about the Bill they had introduced. That did not appear to him to be a satisfactory reason why the scope of its application should be restricted. This Bill was supposed to be a substitute for an Employers' Liability Bill, but it only took in half the workmen who came under the Bill of 1893, and, though it claimed to include the most dangerous trades, it excluded the most dangerous of all trades from the point of view of injury and loss of life—namely, seamen, while deadly and dangerous trades, where injury to health ought to be interpreted as an accident, were not to be admitted. The Bill was illogical and inconsistent, and, in its main provisions, could not be defended. It was, however, an experiment, of a tentative character, in the right direction, which they hoped to extend to trades that were now excluded. Let them have a schedule of trades which, when the included trades had had 12 months' advantages of this Bill, should slowly and automatically be co-opted within its provisions. He should also like to know from the Colonial Secretary what was going to be done with regard to the shipbuilding trade. Suppose there was a vessel on the stocks where, in the actual operation of shipbuilding, machinery was not directly used, but men were employed in plating and rivetting, mainly by hand, were those men to come within the Bill? Why was the dividing line so narrow? In building, where machinery was used for joinery and the cutting and preparing of stone, the Bill would apply, but in the case of building where machine-made articles were put together by hand, he was led to believe the Bill would not apply at all. He wanted to know why, when a mortar mill or a steam derrick was used, the man in charge should be compensated, if injured, and the labourer who carried bricks up a ladder in a hod should not? ["Hear, hear!"] The Government must make up their minds either to accept amendment after amendment extending the scope of the Bill and admitting trades unfairly and inconsistently excluded, or else they must take the Bill by the horns, and say: "There is our Bill. It is illogical. It is inconsistent, but it is a good step in the right direction, and we do not intend to accept any amendments." He could understand that course; but if the House was allowed to hope that shipbuilders and dock hands and seamen might be brought within the scope of the Bill, the discussion would go on for three or four weeks, and then with unsatisfactory results. ["Hear, hear!"] He was friendly to the Bill. He wanted to shorten the discussion, and to see the Bill discussed in a statesmanlike way. No amount of criticism, no amount of misrepresentation of the real point of the Bill would dismiss the difficulty under which hon. Members laboured as to what was the real intention of the Government with regard to including amendments. For the moment hon. Members were wandering about without any guidance as to whether the Government intended to extend the application of the principle of the Measure at all. If there was no intention to do so, then let the Government have the decency to apply the Closure—[*laughter*]—and get the Bill through. [" Hear, hear ! "]

Mr. BARTLEY thought they would get on quicker with the Bill if more were included. All the delay would arise in discussing what should be included and what should not. The Bill would undoubtedly pass more rapidly if all trades were included. [" Hear, hear ! "] As it stood, the operation of the Bill would be most anomalous. An accident took place in a trade included in the Bill—and the trades which were now included were, generally speaking, the best paid trades in the country—[" hear, hear ! "]—and if a man was killed his widow and family would get a substantial sum, and if he was only injured, he would himself get a substantial allowance as long as he remained incapacitated, and he would get it in an honourable way as his right under the law. [" Hear, hear ! "] His brother, on the other hand, who was employed in very similar work, but whose trade was not included, met with a similar accident, and if he was killed his widow and family would have to beg for some sort of out-door relief from the guardians of the poor, and if he was incapacitated he would have to do so himself. How long would that state of things be allowed to last? It could not last. It would be an injustice. It would create a scandal and do an immense amount of mischief. [" Hear, hear ! "] All trades must have the same advantage now or later. [" Hear, hear ! "] Of course, it was true that in the case he had given the compensation was to come from the employer and the pittance in the other case from the rates. That was another grotesque anomaly, and could not continue—[" hear, hear ! "]-and although he believed that the ultimate result of the Bill must be that all trades and occupations must come within it, and that provision must be made by the State by special taxation or some other arrangement, it was quite clear it was impossible to trust entirely to the employer. The ultimate result must be to do the thing in a national way. He should, therefore, vote for the inclusion of all trades. [" Hear, hear ! "]

*Sir FRANCIS EVANS (Southampton) said that his hon. Friend on his left, the Member for the Barnard Castle Division, was very deeply interested in coal. He was himself very deeply interested in shipping. Under this Bill, if an injury occurred to one of his hon. Friend's workmen, and he was permanently incapacitated, his hon. Friend was liable, so long as the man was incapacitated, to pay him half his wages. An accident happened to a man in his own employ, and he was not liable. He was excluded by the Bill. He had no doubt there was very good reason why his hon. Friend should pay a large amount of money and he himself should pay none. [*Laughter.*] He ought, no doubt, to feel highly complimented that the precautions he took were sufficient to leave him out of the Bill. He had a great deal of sympathy, and he said so frankly, with the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary. In his speech made on the Shipping Bill of 1884—[*cries of* " Oh ! " *and laughter*]—wishing to accentuate the claims of those for whose care he was himself mainly responsible in his own business—namely, firemen, seamen, and others employed on board ship, he pointed out that the loss of life in the shipping trade was 1 in 354, while the loss of life in collieries was 1 in 454 ; and that, he presumed was exactly the reason why the hon. Member for one of the Yorkshire Divisions to whom he had referred had to pay a large amount if an accident occurred in his mines, while he himself, who had, perhaps, a larger loss, was entirely left outside. [*Laughter.*] He did not want to press the point, because he believed that both the Colonial Secretary and the Home Secretary had taken a great deal of interest in the Bill, and really wanted to get something practical carried. [*Ministerial cheers.*] But the great difficulty was this—and if it could be removed one of the greatest obstacles to the Bill would disappear. He had put down an Amendment to include seamen, firemen, apprentices, and indeed all employed on board ship. There was, however, one difficulty, and it was the only one—he referred to the question of insurance. They could insure every single risk under the Bill except one; and if the Government could find a way out of it they would do a very great service to the working men of the country. It was the one point of the uncertain liability on permanent incapacity. ["Hear, hear!"] Every other risk was insurable; and if the Government would only widen their Bill—he saw the Colonial Secretary did not quite agree with him—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I beg the hon. Member's pardon; he must not assume that.

*Sir F. EVANS was very glad to know that, because this was a business question; and, after all, if the Bill was going to do any good it must be settled on business lines. Now, as to this one question of insurance. His hon. Friend below the Gangway (Mr. Burns) had just referred to it. Insurance was a thing that was very badly understood by the working men representatives in this country. They said, "If you insure us, you are going to open the door to this kind of thing—that employers will not try to prevent accidents." Let him assure them that was not the point at all; because if employers did not insure outside, they insured inside. No man who had a large concern ever thought of passing his profit and loss account until he had debited it with a charge for accidents and everything of that kind. If they insured outside, it was because experience taught them that they did not require to put so much upon it. If they put 4 per cent. against certain risks, and outside people were willing to take those risks at 3 per cent., as business men they went to the outside people. But to say that they must not insure, whether they went outside or not, was perfectly absurd. Now, if the Government would only find some way—he did not care what it was—if they would only fix some date or some sum of money as a limit to this risk of permanent incapacity, it was the only risk that he cared about in the Bill. He did not know what the Home Secretary or the Colonial Secretary thought about it. He admitted that they could not include every trade in the Bill at this moment. If they tried to do so, they would probably prolong the Debates so as to prevent the Bill getting through at all. He wanted to get the Bill through, and he thought they ought to get it through. ["Hear, hear!"] He had taken very great pains to find out what would have been the effect of this Bill in the shipping industry had it been in operation during the past four or five years. The firm with which he was connected had hundreds of men in their employ, and he could tell the House that it practically amounted to less than they would willingly give themselves for the protection of those men. He pressed the Bill upon the House; he hoped it would be carried through this Session; and he regretted very much that the Government had not found it possible to include the whole of the workmen of the country. He was sure it would lead to that by-and-bye, to the great benefit of the workmen.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I entirely recognise the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken as one of the friends of the Bill. I thank him for what he has said in reference to the particular trade of which he is such a distinguished representative, and I will endeavour to reply to the remarks he has made in reference to that particular trade. Certainly the Government have no right to complain of the full discussion of the very important point which has now been raised again—which was raised on the Second Reading of the Bill, and which is now raised again at the very outset of the Committee. I am afraid it will be necessary for me to repeat myself in endeavouring to answer the arguments that have been brought forward. Sir, the point which we are discussing is really what I may describe as a point touching the principle of the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] It is a question of principle whether this Bill shall apply universally to every form of manual labour, or whether it shall be in any way restricted. We are not dealing now, as some hon. Members seem to think, with the question whether it should be applied to this or that particular trade; we are dealing with the point whether or not there should be any kind of restriction whatever. Upon that we take our stand. This is not a Bill which is to be applied without exception to every trade and to every form of labour; and I must protest against the line taken by some hon. Members opposite, who complain that this Bill is a very unsatisfactory Bill because it does not apply to every form of labour. Why, Sir, who are the persons who make this complaint? They are the persons who received as if it were a new gospel, who described as the charter of the working man, the Bill of my right hon. Friend the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith). That Bill proposed to deal with an additional one-tenth of the whole of the accidents which occur in our industrial occupations.

Mr. ASQUITH: It dealt with all trades. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: That has nothing whatever to do with the argument. It surely is no answer to the argument I am bringing before the House, which is this—that hon. Members opposite, when they were supporting a Government, could not be too enthusiastic with regard to a Bill which added only one-tenth of the accidents which take place to those that were already dealt with in the Statute Book, and it is not consistent in them to complain that this Bill does not go far enough because it only deals, say, with 60 or 70 per cent. of the accidents. ["Hear, hear!" *and dissent.*] Well, it deals with the whole of the accidents that occur in the trades with which it is concerned; and I undertake to say that this Bill will deal with between 60 and 70 per cent. of the whole of the accidents which occur in the country, while my right hon. Friend's dealt only with 30 per cent. I do not complain now of the Bill of my right hon. Friend, although I think that the principle of that Bill was wrong and that it would have been a better Bill if he had adopted the principle which we now submit to the Committee. But I do not wish to go back to old controversies. All I say is that it is unreasonable to complain of us, who have covered so much larger a field, on the ground that we do not go far enough when, only a few years ago, all the Members on the other side of the House were perfectly satisfied with the small contribution of the right hon. Member for East Fife to the settlement of the question. We have to deal with three classes of criticism. There is the criticism of those who are sincere friends of the principle of this Bill and who think that in some ways it may be improved, amended, and extended, and whom I have no doubt we shall be able in the course of these discussions to meet to some extent. Then we have the critics who are confessedly opposed to the Bill in the interests of the trades which they represent. That is the legitimate form of opposition if it comes into the open. If hon. Members who hold the view that their trades will be sacrificed by this Bill would tell us so and oppose the Measure on that ground, I should be prepared to give the greatest consideration to their arguments and I could appreciate their position. But I do not think it is quite fair that the opposition of these Gentlemen should take this indirect form. It is not fair to overlay the Bill with Amendments which are intended to extend its scope, and so to bring into the field a larger amount of opposition. It is plain that these Gentlemen are actuated by a desire to obtain allies, and, therefore, I cannot pay the same attention to their arguments as I should do if they openly avowed their opposition. It is not a fair way of meeting the complaint that a particular trade will suffer under this Bill to urge that a number of other trades should be included in order that the representatives of those trades may be added to the existing opponents of the Bill. Then there is another class of criticism. It is that of Gentlemen who think that this is a most admirable Bill, but who regret that it has been brought in by what they are pleased to call a Tory Government. [*Laughter.*] But as practical people we are not arguing at this stage the logic and consistency of the Bill; we are not contending that it may not be found, when this Bill is passed, that an extension of its application is desirable. All we say is that, knowing what the House of Commons is capable of, and knowing what public opinion is at the present time, we have gone practically and substantially as far as we can safely go. ["Hear, hear!"] That is a statement which I have made again and again, and of which I am not in the slightest degree ashamed. It does not affect that statement in the least to bring forward the case of two brothers, one of whom is in one business and the other in another, one of whom will get the advantage of the Bill, while the other will not. Let the one who gets the advantage be glad, and let the other not stand, like the dog in the manger, in the way of his brother. Let him wait his opportunity—[*laughter*]—and if it be found that his brother has got this advantage without all the injury to trade which many hon. Members, possibly on both sides of the House, conscientiously believe may be inflicted by this Bill, then he will have a superabundant case, an unanswerable case, for claiming an extension of the Measure to his particular industry. In the meantime it is no answer to tell us that this Bill is worth nothing because it only deals with 60 or 70 per cent. of cases, and that there are some people outside its scope who might make out as good a claim as those within it. We do not deny the claims of those who are left out, but we say, let them wait for the experience which will be gained when this Bill has become law, and if that experience is what we believe it will be, then will be the time for them to make their demand. In making our proposals in this form we are following the precendent of all legislation which touches large and important industrial interests. And nothing would be more foolish than to make a vast scheme of this kind applicable universally before we have gained experience. Substantially, therefore, we have gone as far as we ought to go.

Sir F. EVANS: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly give the Committee his views on the point to which I have referred? If you limit the area to which you apply the Bill, of course you affect the question of insurance, and so, in a sense, handicap your own Measure. By limiting the application you must raise the insurance premium. I want the Bill to be made as wide as possible for that reason.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My hon. Friend is a little impatient. I am going to deal with the arguments he has used, but before I come to particulars I must dispose of the general question. I repeat that, it being a question of principle whether the Bill should be universally applied or whether it should be restricted, the Government hold that it ought to be restricted, although the question of what the restriction should be may be a matter for subsequent discussion. We hold, therefore, that the Committee ought not to accept the Amendment. The hon. Member for Battersea says that we are allowing the Committee to drift, and urges that if we take the view that the Bill should be more or less restricted we ought at once to declare that we will allow no Amendment, no extension of any kind, and that we will use the Closure freely to bring the discussion to an end.

Mr. BURNS: The right hon. Gentleman is hardly fair in interpreting my remarks in that way. He has practically told the Committee that as far as the question of admitting more trades—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Is this to be another speech?

Mr. BURNS: The Chairman will call me to order if I transgress. If the right hon. Gentleman will have the patience to listen I will put him right. The right hon. Gentleman is in error in saying I want to prevent any Amendments from being moved. What I want is that the Government should tell the Committee whether or not there are to be any additions to the trades dealt with under this Bill. Of course, as regards points of machinery there must be Amendments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member clearly does not recollect what he said himself. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. BURNS: The House does, and I will accept its decision. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: There need be no heat in this matter. I am not at all anxious to misrepresent the hon. Member. I understood him to complain of the Government because they had not made a clear declaration, and I think he used these exact words—that they had two alternatives, either to admit all trades or to say that they would admit none, but use the Closure and bring this discussion to an end. I was going on to say that we cannot accept his position that there are only two alternatives or that that would be at all a reasonable point of view to take. We do not intend to treat the House in that manner. [*Cheers.*] We have said we will not accept Amendments which point to universal inclusion. I do not say we will not accept any extension—that is going too far—and we are not prepared to put the Closure on if, hereafter, at the proper time, reasons are given why a particular trade should be included which is now excluded, or a particular portion of a trade in the same way. That, I think, is perfectly reasonable. ["Hear, hear!"] I have tried to point out to the House that we are now, as it were, discussing the Second Reading of the principle whether or no there shall be universal inclusion. I have made clear what is the intention of the Government in regard to it. Then comes the question whether a particular trade which is now excluded should be included. This is not the time to discuss it. That point must come upon the definition clause which defines the trades to which the Bill applies, and when the time comes that hon. Members will accept the general decision—or after the House has voted upon it—and reserve their Amendments till the second clause, then the Government will be prepared to give most careful consideration to any Amendment proposing to include any particular trade. [*Cheers.*] Let me say that I do not think there are many trades excluded by this Bill in its present form which it will be right to include, but I have already pointed out on the Second Reading that there is one inclusion which we ought to make—namely, with regard to the building trade. I then explained that owing to a slip in the drafting of the Bill it would appear that we had not included all that is now included in the Factory Acts which we had intended to do. I believe there is an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean to include buildings which are over 30ft. in height, and to that we shall most certainly assent. [*Cheers.*] There must be cases of omissions of a similar nature which we ought to include. But a much larger question was raised by my hon. Friend opposite, and I now come to his point. He, I think, suggested that the shipping trade as a whole should be included, and he pointed out with great candour that the great business in which he is engaged is responsible for a larger loss of life than many other trades included in the Bill.

*SIR F. EVANS: Scarcely larger.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: At the time at which I spoke on this subject the loss of life in shipping was larger than the loss of life in mines or any other industry with which I was then acquainted. I know that, as a consequence both of the agitation which took place then and also of subsequent legislation, and of the care and regulations which have been adopted by my successors at the Board of Trade, the proportion of loss of life has very much diminished, and is now 1 in 124, or something of that sort, whereas when I spoke in 1884 it was 1 in 51. ["Hear, hear!"] So that a very material change for the better has taken place, although it is still true that the loss of life is very large. And what do I gather from that? I gather from that that the shipping trade must be dealt with. ["Hear, hear!"] I make absolutely no pledge on behalf of the Government, because I think pledges of this kind are very imprudent, as no one knows what may happen in a Session that has yet to come. But I say that after this Bill has been passed, it will be the duty of some Government to deal with the shipping trade. [*Cheers.*] All I have argued for is that the shipping trade should be dealt with on somewhat different principles to trades on land, because I think the conditions under which the trade is carried on are essentially distinct. ["Hear, hear!"] Now comes my hon. Friend the Member for Southampton, and I think he suggests that the trade is already ripe to be dealt with, and that it might safely be included even in the present Bill. Does he speak for the shipping trade? Because if my hon. Friend, who is most influential in the shipping trade, is able to bring to this House the assurance that the trade which he represents—not himself alone, but the trade, which is a vast and great industry—has convinced itself from a perusal of this Bill that it can safely be applied to that industry, all I can say is that a statement of that kind is unanswerable, and I cannot conceive that any Government could under any such circumstances refuse to include that trade.

*SIR F. EVANS observed that he could only speak for his own company.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I must leave it there. All I can say is, that up to the present time the indications go to show that the vast majority of the trade do feel that some special consideration should be given to the special circumstances under which this great industry is being conducted. If that is their view, I think it would be wise for the House to postpone all dealing with the shipping trade until it can be dealt with in a separate Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] I have only one other remark to make, and that is as to what fell from my hon. Friend with regard to insurance. Certainly it is most important, in dealing with a Bill of this kind, in which we are seeking compensation of and relief to the workmen, and not punishment of the employer, that insurance should be encouraged, and should be made easy in every way in which we can do so. I agree with my hon. Friend that the uncertainty which may prevail at present in regard to the scheme for compensation in regard to permanent incapacity, may interfere with the framing of a proper scale of insurance. If that be so, I think it would be perfectly possible to make that provision more definite so as to facilitate the process of insurance. But as regards the question of including other trades, I can only say that, dealing with a constituency of 6,000,000, which is the least number of workmen we are dealing with in the Bill, you have got a field so large that there should be no difficulty in framing insurance regulations with regard to them, and I am assured by those most expert in the matter that there will be no difficulty whatever in framing insurance in connection with the trades specified in this Bill if the schedule which deals with the amount of compensation is made more definite in all its particulars. That does not necessarily mean that it is made less favourable to the workmen, but only that it is made more definite, so that the actual amount of the insurance can more easily be calculated. I think I have said enough to show that the Government are prepared to meet all practical points as far as they can in deference to opinion from all sides of the House, and I hope that the House will be content very speedily to come to a decision on what I have said is a point of principle—namely, whether or no there shall be any restrictions in the scope and purview of this Bill. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. HALDANE said he was thankful that this Bill had been brought in by a Tory Government, though he could not refrain from stating that, had it been brought in by their opponents, those who framed the Measure would have been subjected to denunciations, called at the very least pinchbeck Robespierres, and denounced as the exponents of Socialism. The Bill, it was true, had been received with a chorus of assent expressed in different ways, but that assent rested on grounds more substantial than the mere desire on the part of great employers of labour to come within its provisions. It was a Measure which let off those who came within its provisions from a large share of liability for accidents, and the ground on which he objected to the exclusion of a large number of cases of employment was that the Bill did not place employers of labour on the same footing in the matter of benefits. The law was being substantially altered, and he objected to the arbitrary division of the employers of labour into two classes—those who remained under the law at the present time, and those who were exempted from all liability under existing provisions. Looking at the latter portion of Clause 2, it would be found that an employer of labour was only liable in the case of accident if his act was "wrongful and wilful"; and what that phrase meant remained yet to be determined, but it might mean something different from what was the case under the existing state of things.

Sir JAMES JOICEY said that, having listened carefully to the Debate, he had come to the conclusion that, whatever might be the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, the strongest arguments had been adduced in the discussion in favour of making the Bill general. ["Hear, hear!"] He failed to gather from the Colonial Secretary one sound argument in favour of the course which the Government had adopted. What they objected to was the injustice which this Measure created. Instead of putting all employers on the same footing, it selected special industries, and he had failed to glean the real reason why this method of treatment had been followed. What became of those injured in the excluded trades? If a man was killed, his widow and family in all probability came on the rates. Who paid those rates? The very industries included in the Bill. So the included industries not only paid for their own accidents, but had to pay a considerable proportion for the accidents of other trades. The Home Secretary had divided into sections the supporters of the Bill. He did not gather from anything that had been said that there was any section of Members who wished to destroy the Bill. As to motives, if they began to inquire into these, he was afraid the motives of some of those who supported the Bill would not, perhaps, bear close examination. But he was glad to find there was no opposition to the principle of the Bill. That was one reason why the principle of the Bill should be applied to every trade. In excluding certain trades the Government not only created a great injustice as far as employers were concerned, but as regarded workmen too. There were as many fair-minded men among the working class as in any class of the community, who believed in justice even to an employer. When this Bill came to be understood by the working men of this country it would be seen by them to be most unjust, not only to their fellow workmen left outside, but to the employers included. He was surprised that the agricultural labourers were not included in the scope of the Bill. He should have thought that if there was any Government which would attend to the interests of the agricultural labourers in this matter, it was a Government composed of gentlemen like the President of the Local Government Board, the Under Secretary to the Local Government Board, and the Under Secretary for the Home Office. The latter had raised his voice in the country when injustices were done to the agricultural labourer, but was silent in that House when an injustice was being done to them. He was surprised that a class like the agricultural labourers, so represented and patronised by the Conservative Party should have been left out of its scope altogether. He was glad the fishing industry was to be included. He intended to press on the Government to include as many interests as possible, and he hoped they would listen to reason in the matter.

*MR. TOMLINSON wished to complain of the undue haste with which the Committee stage of what was admitted to be a Bill of great importance had been pressed on. It was remarkable that, though as far as the principle of the Bill was concerned it had received the general approval of the House, there had only been five days to consider what Amendments were required to meet the necessary difficulties in the detail of the Measure. The Bill as it stood included certain industries and left others out. The alternative proposal was that they should put all industries *primâ facie* into the Bill, and exclude by exception those to which the Bill was not applicable. Time had not been allowed to frame the necessary exceptions, and therefore it was only possible to vote with imperfect knowledge of the alternative scheme. He thought, on the whole, that the preferable course was to begin with inclusion and exclude by exception.

MR. McKENNA reminded the Committee that the Home Secretary said he would give a favourable consideration to any proposed amendments to the existing employers' liability law which would affect trades excluded under the Bill as it now stood. But under the decision of Mr. Speaker it was quite clear that the hope held out by the Home Seecretary would fail, and they should not therefore have any opportunity of reviewing the action of this Bill in comparison with a good employers' liability Bill such as that introduced by the late Home Secretary. He would point out the condition under this Bill of certain trades carried out in the same town in workshops, in factories, and in home industry. A factory employer would be bound to compensate the workman, but the very same workman, engaged in the same trade and the same town, under identically the same regulations, rules, and conditions as to wages, would not be compensated if engaged in workshop labour, and still less would he be compensated in home industry. Therefore, under this Bill they were inflicting a punishment upon a particular employer as against other employers engaged in the same industry in the same locality. That alone would be a sufficient reason for including all industries in the Measure. He supported the Amendment on the ground that its tendency undoubtedly would be to make insurance universal. If all trades were included in the Bill the inevitable tendency would be for the State to form an insurance office in which every employer would be compelled to insure, and that was the only possible solution of the question.

Question put, "That the words 'to which this Act applies,' stand part of the clause."—The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 155.—(Division List, No. 216.)

MR. McKENNA moved in sub-section (1) to leave out the words "arising out of and." These words, he contended, were unnecessary and would lead to confusion. He put the case of two hewers working in a colliery side by side. If the pick-axe of one hewer flew out of his hand and injured the other, was that an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight): Certainly.

Mr. McKENNA said that covered the case so far as the action was unintentional, but what if the pick-axe was intentionally thrown by the one man at the other? If that case also came under the Bill these words were surplusage. He might also take the case of a fall in the roof of a colliery which injured a man, but which might be from some extraneous cause, such as the firing of a shot in another part of the mine.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said he understood the hon. Member to suggest that anything which happened to a workman while he was engaged on his work should be within the Bill, but that was not what they intended. To take the case cited by the hon. Member, if the hewer out of malice, drove his pick-axe at the other man, it was not an accident arising out of the man's employment. The words were really necessary.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. GALLOWAY moved at the end of sub-section (1), after the word "Act," to insert the words—

"notwithstanding the fact that any such workman may be at the same time in receipt of any benefit from any registered friendly society."

The object of this Amendment was very plain and simple. The Secretary for the Colonies said there was no intention to do anything that would injure the great friendly societies of the country. The Amendment would guard the members of these societies from being penalised, because they were members.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY could not see that it was the intention of the Bill to in any way penalise members of the friendly society, and the words proposed were absolutely unnecessary.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. J. L. WALTON (Leeds, S.) moved to insert at the end of sub-section (1) the words:

"Such compensation shall be payable, whether the injury occasioned arises from the act of the employer or of some person in his employ, or from the act of a stranger thereto. Provided that where such injury shall be occasioned by the act of a stranger under circumstances creating a legal liability to pay damages in respect thereof, the workman may, at his option, proceed either at law against such person to recover damages, or against his employer for compensation under this Act, and if he be compensated under this Act the employer shall be entitled to enforce in the name of the workman all rights of action possessed by him against the person occasioning such injury as aforesaid."

He thought the right hon. Gentleman would admit that this was a reasonable Amendment, and in illustration he mentioned the case of a stevedore. The workman should be entitled to compensation under the Act, in which case the employer would pay the compensation which devolved upon him, but the employer should be entitled to pursue a cause of action for negligence at common law when negligence had occasioned the injury to the workman, and involved liability to the employer. The Amendment was conceived in no spirit hostile to the Bill, but with a view to advance what he felt must be the aim of those responsible for the Bill.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY thought that this was a very reasonable proposal, but he had some doubt as to whether it should not be brought up in the form of a new clause. He was willing the Amendment should be inserted, subject to its form being reconsidered at a later stage.

Amendment agreed to.

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) moved, in Sub-section (1), after the word "Act," to insert the words:—

"Such compensation to have a like priority in payment, in case of winding up or bankruptcy, as have wages under the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act 1888, or any Act for the time being regulating the priority of wages in bankruptcy or winding up."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that the Government were disposed to accept the principle of the Amendment, but they suggested that the proposal should take the form of a new clause. One reservation he had to make. It was not quite clear that the capital amount—£150 or £300—ought to be in exactly the same position as the preferential claim.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SETON-KARR proposed, in Subsection (2), after the word "that," to insert:—

"(a) The employer shall not be liable under this Act to pay compensation to any workman by whose wilful and wrongful act or default the accident arises in respect of which compensation for injury may become payable."

As long as the Government accepted the principle of his Amendment, he was not particular as to the form it took. It did, however, seem to him but fair that compensation should not be paid to a workman who was injured through his own wilful act of negligence. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite contained the words "for his defence." He did not desire to see those words inserted. He did not desire to see inserted in the Bill words which would in the case of a man who was killed through his own fault or wilful negligence prevent his widow and family from getting compensation. They were not concerned in the act of the man himself, and he would only desire to move the Amendment so as not to allow compensation to a man who was injured by his own wilful negligence. He pressed his Amendment on the Government. All he asked was that they should take the idea and put it into the Bill in their own way.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he did not suppose the House would desire to decide this question that night. [*Cheers.*] It raised a matter of considerable importance—["hear, hear!"]—upon which the Government would like to have some guidance from the House. The fact was, that even supposing they accepted the principle of the Amendment, there would be a question as to the form in which it should be carried out. There was an important Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Baronet the Member for Durham which was intended to make a similar provision, although it was in different words. The House, of course, would have to consider really the question between justice and expediency. Justice required that something in the nature of this Amendment should be accepted. [*Cheers.*] There was no doubt about that. It was most unfair that a man who had deliberately disobeyed, in the most flagrant way, an order given to him, and had thereby caused injury to others as well as to himself, should be himself compensated for his wilful or wrongful act. The people who had suffered by his action would, of course, be compensated in any case, but it was grossly unfair that the man should himself be actually paid for his wrongful act. That was what he called the side of justice. On the other hand, there was the question of expediency, which arose out of this consideration—was it worth while to add another litigable point to the Bill in connection with cases which, after all, must necessarily be rare? [*Opposition cheers.*] He had stated the problems the House would have to consider, and he hoped that to-morrow they would have some guidance from the House. The Government at present preserved an open mind. [*Cheers.*] He would now move "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." ["Hear, hear!"]

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the Third time." Debate arising;

And, it being Midnight, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Thursday.

SUPPLY [21ST MAY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £114,389, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland, including certain grants in aid of Local Taxation."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,243, be granted to Her Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland."

POOR LAW BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

POST OFFICE (SITES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Committee deferred till Monday next.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

LAW OF EVIDENCE (CRIMINAL CASES) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.—Bill withdrawn.

FINANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Thursday.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Tomorrow.

SCHOOL BOARDS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PATENT OFFICE EXTENSION (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Thursday.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tomorrow.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

WAYS AND MEANS [21ST MAY].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue."

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, that it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Finance Bill that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution. —*(Chancellor of the Exchequer.)*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

SOLICITORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 29th June.

MARRIED PERSONS' SMALL INDUSTRIAL INCOMES (TAX RELIEF) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

BOILER INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (SCOTLAND) LOANS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (LONDON) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SHOP ASSISTANTS (HALF-HOLIDAY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

DISTRICT COUNCILS (WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

ACCESS TO MOUNTAINS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 25th June.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 14th June.

TITHE REDEMPTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 14th June.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MARRIED WOMEN (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

ELECTION PETITIONS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Wednesday.

MARKET GARDENERS' COMPENSATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till To-morrow.

COLONIAL SOLICITORS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 17th June.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MOTIONS.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Licensing (Scotland) Acts 1828 to 1887, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Provand, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Charles Cameron, and Mr. Baird; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 268.]

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (IRELAND) REGISTRATION.

Bill to amend the Law relating to Registration of Parliamentary Voters in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Tully, Colonel Waring, Mr. Power, and Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh; presented, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Thursday, and to be printed.—[Bill 269.]

House Adjourned at a Quarter after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 25th May 1897.

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with Amendments. The Report thereof to be received on Friday next; and Bill to be printed as amended.—[No. 98.]

EXCISE LICENCES BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to consolidate the enactments granting and relating to the duties payable upon excise licences—Was presented by Viscount Peel; Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be Read 2ª on Tuesday next.—[No. 99.]

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE) rose to move the Second Reading of this Bill. He said: In the Education Bill which was introduced in the other House last Session, clauses were contained which, besides providing for a certain amount of assistance to Voluntary Schools, were intended also to meet the case of the acknowledged grievance of the excessive educational burden in some School Board districts, and when the Bill which had passed through Parliament this Session was introduced dealing only with the question of aid to Voluntary Schools, a pledge was given that a further Measure would be brought in, if time permitted, giving a certain amount of assistance to districts where the pressure upon the ratepayers has been found to be unduly excessive, and this Bill has been introduced and passed through the other House in pursuance of that pledge. I am perfectly aware that this Measure is considered by some noble Lords opposite as being very inadequate. I do not imagine, however, inadequate as they may conceive it to be, that it is likely to meet with any more opposition here than it met with in the other House, and, therefore, I do not think it will be necessary for me to enter into any elaborate explanation of the details of this Bill. If I were to attempt to give such an explanation it would of necessity be rather intricate and complicated. But probably the proposals of the Government, after the discussions in the other House, are already tolerably well understood by those who take any considerable interest in the subject, and I am afraid that I must despair of being able to make the details of the Measure clear to those who have not already taken any such interest in the matter. It may, therefore, be sufficient for me to say that this Bill is an extension and to some degree a modification of the 97th Section of the Education Act of 1870. That clause is itself rather complicated in character, and, indeed, has not been fully understood. It has not been understood by all the School Boards to which it applies, for it was found in the discussions of last year that a considerable number of School Boards which would have been able to claim some assistance under this section had always omitted to do so, and the amount that had been claimed since the Debates of last year called attention to the matter has considerably increased the payments made under the section, which was explained in 1870 by Mr. Gladstone in the other House. It was supposed at that time that the expenditure on school maintenance in Board Schools as well as in Voluntary Schools would not exceed the sum of 27s. or 28s. per child in average attendance, and that in addition to the annual grants provided by the Government and the fees which the schools would receive from the children an expenditure of not more than 7s. 6d. per child in average attendance would have to be provided from the rates. In districts where the 3d. rate would be sufficient to provide this amount of 7s. 6d. it was thought that the burden on the locality would not be excessive, and the section had no application to them; but where the district was so poor, or where the number of children who had to be educated in Board Schools was so large, that a 3d. rate would not provide the sum of 7s. 6d. per scholar in average attendance, the section made provisions for a special grant which should supplement the produce of a 3d. rate up to a limit of 7s. 6d. per child. But the expectations entertained at that time have not been fulfilled. The expenditure upon the maintenance of children in Board Schools now amounts on the average to a sum of over £2 10s. The Government subvention has been largely increased, and now amounts to £1 9s. 6d. per child; but, in spite of that increase in the Government grant, a balance is left over which has to be provided by the locality, amounting to 20s. 6d. per child instead of 7s. 6d., which was the estimate for 1870. These figures are only the figures for the average maintenance of schools. Besides this, the School Boards have to find for interest on loans, and for repayment of loans, a further amount of 14s. per child. They also have imposed upon them other expenses, such as those of management, election expenses, and the expenses of schools for the deaf and blind, and the total expenditure of School Boards out of the rates has now risen to the sum of £2 2s., which is equivalent to a 9d. rate all over the country. The provision, therefore, which was made by Section 97 has proved inadequate to meet what were supposed to be the needs of the poorer School Boards, and in a great many districts in the country the school rate has become abnormally high. If the expenditure per scholar in all School Boards had remained the same this state of things might have been met by a simple extension of the plan laid down in the 97th Section, which took into account only the two elements of the rateable value of districts and the number of children in attendance in School Boards. That plan, together with some adjustment of the actual rates, might have provided successfully for the increased School Board expenditure if that expenditure had not varied greatly in different districts. The expenditure necessarily varies according as the Board is called upon to provide for the whole of the children in a district, for a very large number of them, or for none at all, as is the case in some localities. It varies also according to the character of the district. If the children can be educated in a very few large schools, the cost is, of course, less than where they have to be educated in a larger number of smaller schools. It varies also because it is found that higher salaries have to be paid to the teachers in certain districts than have to be paid in others. In attempting to deal with this question, therefore, it has been found necessary to introduce an additional element into the plan of the 97th Section—an element additional to that of rateable value, and to that of the number of children in Board Schools. We have had to take into consideration the amount of the rate which has been found to be necessary to provide for the expenses of the School Boards. This Bill, therefore, proposes to do away with a fixed limit of 7s. 6d., and to substitute in its place a sliding scale by which that limit is increased in a certain proportion to the rate levied. The subvention which it is proposed to give will be increased, not in direct proportion to the amount of the school rate, which might evidently lead to undue expenditure and extravagance, but in a ratio which will be ascertained by putting together the three elements of rateable value, the number of children in the schools, and the amount of the rate which it has been found necessary to levy in order to meet the expenses of the Board. Perhaps I may explain the operation of the Bill by giving one or two examples of the way in which it will work in certain districts principally affected. I take, in the first place, the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire, where the population is engaged chiefly in mining. There the School Board has to provide for an average attendance of 3,074 children. The produce of a 3d. rate per scholar is only 3s. 6d.; the rate in the pound is 1s. 6d., and the limit of the Section in this case will be raised by this Bill from 7s. 6d. to 12s. 6d., and the grant per head which it is estimated the district will receive will be 9s. in lieu of 4s., which it now receives. The total subvention which it will get will be £1,385, instead of £616. Still more important is the county borough of West Ham in the county of Essex, which is practically a suburb of East London. A very large working population, chiefly employed in various industries in London, is collected there, and education is carried on almost entirely in Board Schools. West Ham has an average attendance of 33,024 children; the produce of the 3d. rate is 6s. 3d., the School Board rate in the pound is 2s. 2d., and the limit will be raised under this Bill from 7s. 6d. to 15s. 2d., and the grant per head of the children in average attendance will be raised from 1s. 3d. to 8s. 11d., while the county borough of West Ham will receive a subvention of £14,723 in lieu of £2,064. There are other districts not equally necessitous, but which still educate a very large proportion of their children in the Board Schools, which will receive help of varying amounts, though considerably smaller. Such places as Hull, Leeds, Leicester, Nottingham, Portsmouth, Sheffield, Sunderland, and Swansea will all receive certain amounts, but not nearly so large as those to which I have referred. There are, on the other hand, other districts in which the 3d. rate produces a very considerable sum per scholar—in other words, a small rate provides for a very considerable expenditure, and they will not receive any benefit at all under this Measure. Such districts are London, Liverpool, Manchester, Brighton, Bristol, and Newcastle. In those places the 3d. rate produces £1, or even more, per head of the scholars in average attendance. There are other districts less wealthy where the resources which they possess in the rates do not, as it is believed, give them any special claim on account of their poverty to receive any assistance from the extension which it is proposed to give to the 97th Section of the Act. I think, on the whole, it may be said that this relief will be given in cases where the need is the most urgent. No attempt to equalise the educational burden in every part of the country would be possible unless, as some have desired, the cost of education were made a national instead of a local charge; but so long as the settlement of 1870 is maintained, and it is admitted that to a large extent the burden of education is to remain a local charge, this Bill appears to go in the direction of alleviating the most pressing and the most obvious grievances and inequalities which exist under the present system. The total annual cost of the subvention to School Boards is estimated at nearly £154,000. The similar grants under the present system are £43,000; and therefore the Bill will entail an extra cost of £110,600. The present Measure will afford a larger measure of relief to the necessitous School Boards than the proposal which was contained in the Bill of last year, the total cost of which for poor School Boards was estimated at £89,000. It may, perhaps, be imagined by some that this proposal, while introducing a new element in the amount of the School Board rate, may lead to extravagant administration. It might have done so but for the fact that the aid which it is proposed to give is restricted to those districts where a 3d. rate produces less than a certain sum per child, or where the rateable value, compared with the number of scholars, falls below a certain amount. In such cases it is obvious that a School Board cannot provide for the average expenditure which is found necessary in School Boards generally, except by a very much larger rate than an average rate exceeding the average rate over the country of 9d. It has been ascertained by careful examination that in the most extreme cases which could be produced, a district, in order to obtain an additional grant from the Treasury, would have to tax itself to at least three times that amount, and in a great majority of cases it would have to tax itself by a rate exceeding five or six times any amount that could be expected from the Treasury. In such cases I think extravagant administration in districts so poor is almost impossible. On the contrary, what is most to be apprehended in the case of poor School Board districts like these is rather an undue economy than any tendency towards extravagance. I have no wish to enter on any controversial matters. I have no reason to suppose that the Bill is likely to meet with much opposition, but I submit this proposal with some confidence in opposition to that which I understand has found favour with some noble Lords opposite. It was suggested, I think, in our Debates on the Voluntary Schools Bill, that a fairer arrangement, and one which would have met no opposition from the other side, would have been an equal grant of 5s. per head in Voluntary and Board Schools all round. That proposal would have given less than the present humble proposal which we have to make to those districts which appear to require it most. It seems to me that it would have involved a very large additional expenditure, and if the money were not actually wasted in unnecessary and extravagant expenditure, at least it may be said that it was not required. Any part of 5s. a head, if given to the London School Board, would not even have the effect of relieving the London ratepayers to an equal extent. A part of it would undoubtedly have gone to incrase expenditure, which, in the opinion of many, is already excessive. It would have had the effect of increasing and intensifying the competition, especially in the matter of teachers' salaries, which makes it difficult for Voluntary Schools to exist in London and other large towns. It was not needed in such places in order to secure efficiency. It is admitted that the Board Schools in London and other great and wealthy towns are already efficient, and are made efficient without any extravagant claim being made on the resources of the ratepayers. It is extremely difficult to meet arguments which one fails to understand, and I cannot understand how any man who is of opinion that education is to remain a local charge, and to a certain extent a varying local charge, can argue that it it would be just to apply an equal subvention from Imperial funds to those districts in which that charge is a heavy one, and in some cases almost an intolerable one, as well as to those other districts in which experience has shown that it is a comparatively light and easily borne charge. I have endeavoured to give a very short—and I hope tolerably clear—statement of what is rather an intricate and complicated question; and I venture with some confidence to move the Second Reading of the Bill. [*Cheers.*]

*LORD PLAYFAIR said that this Bill for aiding necessitous Board Schools was necessarily linked to the Act which had been passed for aiding necessitous Voluntary Schools, but they were to be aided in very different proportions. There were two and a half millions of children in Voluntary Schools, and two millions in Board Schools. As the Act for Voluntary Schools gave to them at the rate of 5s. per child, the natural expectation was that the same amount per child should be given to the Board Schools, but this Bill only gave them about one-fifth the amount. The Act gave to Voluntary Schools upwards of £600,000, and to the Board Schools £110,000. The Education Department might try, and, he hoped, would succeed, in making increased efficiency one of the conditions for increased grants, but as that was not the motive of the Measures, the Department would have a hard struggle to attain it. Those who, like the Bishop of Chester, approved of Lord Hugh Cecil's party cry that Voluntary Schools have a right to consider that "tenure by subscriptions is essentially a tenure by blackmail," would certainly look upon the new grant of £600,000 as a relief Act and not as an educational Act. When the Government announced their intention of giving substantial relief to Voluntary Schools he welcomed the proposal, as he aided Mr. Forster in 1870, and had always valued their great aid to educational progress. He did not grudge in the least the £600,000 given to them, but he strongly regretted that the opportunity was not taken to secure that the sum should be so applied as not only to maintain but increase their efficiency as a great agency for educational progress. This smaller Measure for rate relief to poor Board Schools, which was now to be read a Second time, might, to the extent to which it went, increase the efficiency of education, but only to a small degree. It was the fashion—one which had been much encouraged by the Vice President of the Council—to decry the management and efficiency of rural Board Schools. No doubt there were a good many inferior rural Board Schools, as there were also a good many inferior rural Voluntary Schools, but there was no evidence from the educational statistics that there was any marked difference in rural schools, whether they were managed by School Boards or by Voluntary agencies. He had beside him the returns of 209 rural Voluntary Schools in 12 typical counties, and of 161 Board Schools in the same counties, the result being that the Board Schools paid their teachers an average of 2s. per child more, and that they obtained an average grant of 6d. per child more than the Voluntary Schools. There could, then, be no justification in treating these schools as inferior to Voluntary Schools by giving them only one-fifth of the grant given to the former. The Bill would no doubt become law, but it would leave in the minds of a large portion of the public the impression that, whether these Measures be viewed as relief Bills or as educational Bills, they had given five or six times as much public money to the irresponsible managers of Voluntary Schools as to the accredited and elected educational representatives of the nation. Of the 2,500 School Boards throughout the country, about 1,500 were voluntarily formed by the ratepayers, but 1,000 were compulsorily formed to supply the deficiencies in education not covered by the voluntary system. If the Voluntary Schools might justly claim recognition for relief on account of their voluntary money contributions, surely the 1,000 School Boards, which had to make compulsory contributions under the mandate of the State, might have looked to an equal measure of relief. They had not obtained it, and the Government need not be surprised if many educationists did not accept this Bill as a final settlement of the question. The two Measures which would soon become law might have been so framed that the largely increased grant of about three-quarters of a million, while it relieved tension in subscriptions and rates, might also have greatly increased educational efficiency. The opportunity had been lost, and it was quite certain that before long an agitation for a modification of the Acts would arise in the country, probably from the supporters of both branches of schools.

The Earl of CRANBROOK, dealing with Lord Playfair's criticisms, said the Board Schools, though they did not receive the same amount of public money from the funds of the State, received a vast amount of public money in the shape of rates, of which the Voluntary Schools were altogether deprived. [*Cheers.*] If they were to vote at one time 5s. per head to the Voluntary Schools and 5s. to the Board Schools, they would simply increase the competition, and put upon the Voluntary Schools an additional burden which they were attempting to alleviate at the present moment. He was far from saying that the time might not come when there might not be a reconsideration of many things in connection with education, but at present they were dealing with comparatively small matters. The Voluntary Schools supplied an enormous gap in education—nay, they supplied an amount of education prior to the School Boards which was not only enormous, but was increasing and growing rapidly, and which, even in spite of their being deprived of State grants and other things, had increased enormously since, without calling on the public for money from the rates or from the funds. That being so, they had gone to the expense of a large additional subsidy to the Voluntary Schools, because, if they had not done so, the chances were that the Voluntary Schools would have fallen, and a far larger demand would have been made both upon the rates and the public funds. They had increased the efficiency and expense of education, and that was the reason why they must make increased demands on the public purse, and by that means, too, necessitous Board Schools, where they were necessitous, would also benefit. If, when the experiment was tried, it should be found that something more should be done, no doubt it would be done in due time. Though he should have wished to see larger Measures than these, he welcomed both the Voluntary Schools and the Board Schools Bills. The former afforded the means of maintaining the schools which had done great work in the past, and still had great work to do, and by the latter he trusted that the necessitous Board Schools would be able to work for the advantage of education. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Lord REAY said that the objection to this Bill was not that relief had been given to the Voluntary Schools, but that the relief to be given to the Board Schools was not adequate, and placed those schools in a condition of inferiority. Why should that be? Whatever progress had been made in the matter of primary education in this country had been mainly due to the Board Schools. In many instances they had been in advance of the requirements of the Department, and they had shown a mastery of the subject of education which had been admired all over Europe. They had dealt not only with mental instruction, but in many cases had promoted manual instruction, which was of the greatest importance in primary education. The Board Schools had been accused of extravagance. What had the late Archbishop of Canterbury said:—

> "He should not be so very hard upon it, because the Board School was a magnificent system, which had been set on foot in a grand manner, and had done wonders for the education of the people, and also stimulated the education given in Church schools."

And how did the expenditure compare with that of the Swiss Canton of Zurich? The town of Zurich in 1896 spent two millions of francs on its primary, secondary, and technical schools, or 13 to 14 francs per head of the population. The town of Winterthur, with a population of 20,000, spent, in 1895, 326,000 francs, or more than 16 francs per head of the population, on education. In addition there was a contribution from the canton of about 3½ francs per head of the population. The total expenditure was £4 per head for every child in the elementary schools; one-third of the whole expenditure of the canton was devoted to education. It was alleged against the Board Schools that they did not give definite religious education. The syllabus of the London School Board did not bear out this allegation. What did *The Guardian*—an impartial authority—say on the 15th July last year of the syllabus of the London School Board?

> "It is our firm conviction that if the Conservative Party in the country had to declare, by ballot, the kind of religious instruction they think most suitable to the children in elementary schools, a majority of them would be quite content with the syllabus of the London School Board minus the circular."

The late Archbishop of Canterbury said on this subject:—

> "I am persuaded that in a very great number of Board Schools there is very good religious teaching indeed."

and the Bishop of Durham said that—

> "It had been a constant encouragement to him to notice the work done in Board Schools, and the loyal and true conditions under which the religious instruction was given."

The Blue-book on religious teaching in Board Schools also showed that the results were very satisfactory. The Board School teacher was as conscientious in his teaching as the teacher in the Voluntary School. They were trained at the same denominational colleges, and teachers who had been transferred from Voluntary to Board Schools denied that the religious teaching in the latter was inferior to that in the former. The legitimate requirements of the parents are certainly met. Besides, the Board Schools would be discredited if they did not give the religious teaching which the parents desired. As to the Scotch system, there were very erroneous notions abroad. It was quite true that it gave much more latitude to the School Boards with regard to the nature of the religious teaching. The representatives of the ratepayers, who were also the representatives of the parents, had absolute freedom in this matter, and the use which they had made of that freedom was to a great extent the cause of the success and of the popularity of the Board Schools in Scotland. It was true that the Shorter Catechism was taught in the majority of Scottish Board Schools with the assent of the parents, but by teachers who were appointed and under the direct control of the Boards, and with no control from the clergy except in so far as the clergy were the elected representatives of the ratepayers on the Boards. He was pleased to see that in another place the First Lord of the Treasury had praised the Scottish system; and if primary education were to be paid for out of public funds, there was no doubt that the Scotch system gave the best guarantees for efficient and properly organised education. But this Bill dealt with the pressure of the rate in the School Board districts in England. In the rural districts, as had been admitted by the Vice President of the Council, the situation could only be improved by widening the area over which the rate was levied. There was no justification for a smaller grant being given to the rural parish which had a Board School than to one which had no Board School. There was no reason why in a rural parish with a School Board the ratepayers should have to contribute more than those individuals who supported the Voluntary School in another parish. He could not see why a premium should be placed on the absence of a School Board. A parish with a high rate could be as necessitous as a parish where the school was supported by voluntary contributions. It might be said that the Rating Bill of last year gave relief to the rural districts. That was only true in as far as relief was given to the occupiers of land, but no relief was given to the occupiers of houses. The Assessment Committees were quite free in making deductions from the gross letting value. It was quite clear that if an Assessment Committee made a large deduction from the gross letting value, there would be a lower rateable value, and by so much the chance of getting aid under this Bill would be increased, as against a locality where the rateable value was nearer to the gross letting value. Besides, there were many places with a high rate which would get less or no help which other places with a low rate would obtain. In London there was a rate of 1s., and there were 422,000 children in average attendance. The rates which the School Board would have to pay on its school buildings were estimated this year at £103,000. If London were to be put on the same footing for its Board Schools as for its Voluntary Schools, also with regard to the grant of 5s. per board scholar, it might claim more than £200,000. Again, Plymouth would get nothing, while Devonport would be aided, simply because it had a lower rateable value on account of the rates on the Government buildings being paid by the Government. There was a theory that the State simply contracted for results. That was a theory which he could not admit. The State was responsible for the education of the country, and could not divest itself of this responsibility. It was the duty of the State to stimulate local effort, and to give financial aid on equitable principles. It was because he considered that the Bill deviated from those equitable principles, that he did not believe it would give that stability to our educational system which was needed. ["Hear, hear!"]

*LORD NORTON said that it seemed to him that the criticisms of the Bill were founded on the idea that the proposal of a Treasury Grant for Voluntary Schools and the proposal for relieving the rates of Board Schools were intended to meet a claim of a similar character. That was not so. There was not the slightest relation between the claims of the Voluntary Schools and the claims of the Board Schools. To say, therefore, that it was an unfair thing to give 5s. per head to the one and only 1s. per head to the other, was to say that it was an unfair thing to give money in different amounts for any two totally different objects. The Voluntary Schools gave the public £2,000,000 a year in contribution out of private purses for elementary education, and what these schools required the Treasury grant for was to enable them to carry on the higher branches of education which had been added to their original volunteer. It was positively to save that £2,000,000 a year which was given by the Voluntary Schools that the Treasury came in and said, "As a larger requirement is made now we must meet that requirement, or we shall lose the work that is done by the Voluntary Schools." It was different in the matter of the Board Schools. In certain cases it was found difficult to raise a sufficient rate for the purpose of the Board Schools, and the Bill proposed that in those cases, and only in those cases, the burden should be transferred to a certain extent from the local rates to the Treasury. The whole question of subsidies from imperial and local taxes was a very fair question to raise. Some think that all public money necessary for national education should be provided out of Imperial funds. Such an arrangement would make the taxation fair, and it would avoid the jealousies raised by imposing local taxation for national education in the way of religious rivalry. Comparison had been made between the merits of the Board Schools and the merits of the Voluntary Schools. That had nothing to do with the matter. In the other House the Government were actually accused in bringing forward the first Bill of favouring Voluntary Schools, and with being ready to crush the Board Schools, and they were also told this little Bill offered only hush money to the Board Schools to be silent. The accusation was perfectly absurd and irrelevant. The Government were not favouring the Voluntary Schools, but they were trying to secure them to the country. They were not adverse to the Board Schools by facilitating their public support. He thought the Government were rather weak when they allowed this Bill to be treated as a necessary corollary to the other Bill, for the two Bills had really nothing to do with each other. He supposed it was to get votes for the first Bill, by conciliating opposition, that the Government allowed one to be tacked on to the other. But the Bill now before the House had its own fair claim. There were some places with sparse populations where the required amount of educational rate was difficult to raise, and in those cases it was very right that a portion of the burden of taxation for the schools should be transferred from the local rates to the Treasury. These two Measures were merely temporary makeshifts until the whole subject of elementary and secondary education was dealt with, and he was glad to hear that that complete revision would be dealt with immediately by the Government. A large system of scientific instruction had been added to elementary education, and when they came to deal with the whole subject they would have to separate these two. When that happened neither of these two Measures would be wanted at all. Art apprenticeship would have to be made self-supporting, except in the way of providing scholarships for clever boys of the poorer classes. To say that they should provide higher education for well-to-do classes at the expense of the country was utterly absurd. It would be a fatal discharge of parental responsibility. The whole question was no doubt a very great and difficult one, and he was glad to hear the Government would apply their present strength to cope with it. [*Cheers.*]

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I am reminded by what my noble Friend opposite has said of the rather trite saying that "comparisons are odious." I am sorry to say that, notwithstanding that in the few remarks I propose to make I shall be obliged to make some comparisons. The Bill is undoubtedly a small one; and there is another proverb which I do not forget—that "you must not look a gift horse in the mouth." Therefore, we on this side could not oppose the Bill, even if it could really be opposed in this House, because it does something to relieve the Board Schools. For my part I will make an avowal. Speaking as an individual I prefer the Board Schools to the Voluntary Schools. I thing to-day and always have thought that the only just and wise system is the system of State or Board Schools. But I think it would not have been wise in 1870, and it would not be wise now, to neglect entirely the Voluntary Schools, which as a matter of fact are an important part of the system of education of this country. What I complain of is that this gift to the Board Schools is a mean gift. That meanness has arisen from the fact that there is a very strong, and as it appears to me extraordinary vehement, feeling on the part of the Party which is now in power in this country in favour of the Voluntary Schools and in point of fact against the Board Schools. As Lord Playfair said, there seems to be more a desire to perpetuate one system of schools in this country than to do that which is the one object we should have in view—to see that all schools, be they Voluntary or Board Schools, are thoroughly efficient. As regards the comparison between the Board School and the Voluntary School, I for my part do not see why a subscriber to a school is entitled to more relief from the State than the ratepayer who pays School Board rates. I am a contributor to schools in both capacities; and I do not feel that I am in the least degree more aggrieved by paying a subscription than I am by paying a rate. In one parish I pay a large rate towards the Board School; and in another place, where there is no Board School though I confess I only contribute when I feel that the Voluntary School is desired by the people there—I pay a subscription to a Voluntary School or support a school entirely myself; and I feel I am entitled to as much assistance from the State in one case as in the other. I do not see why the ratepayers' claim should be neglected; and for that reason I think the only fair, just, and wise system would be to give equal subvention to all schools alike. The present system established under this Bill, as the noble Duke ingenuously said, is of so complicated a nature that he did not trouble the House with details. I was very much obliged to the noble Duke, however, for what he did tell us was very clear. The fact is, it is a most complicated system, ingenious as regards the forming of a sliding scale, but as regards equality between the different persons who are to receive aid it is about as unfair and ill-conceived as could possibly be imagined. It may be argued that if you were to give an additional contribution to, say, the London School Board, that would be a terrible thing, as it would increase the expenditure which would fall on the ratepayers of London. But, if the ratepayers of London desire that their schools should be made more efficient by expending more on them, why are they to be deprived of the assistance of the State on that account? It seems to me they are very meritorious if they do so, and that they ought to receive the same assistance from the State. I could not help admiring the manner in which the noble Duke insisted upon the way in which this new Bill had been contrived so as to give assistance only to certain schools which by the Act are so defined that those schools alone will be regarded as necessitous under this Bill. I remember that, when we tried to induce the Government to define necessitous schools in the Voluntary Schools Bill, we were told it was impossible and unnecessary. Under this Bill an attempt is made to give only to schools which are necessitous. Why not have applied the same system in both cases? This system of only giving the public money where it is most required, is quite a new principle with the Government. I have not forgotten the Agricultural Rates Bill; we tried hard then to persuade them to give the money only to those particular parts of the country which really needed it, but they refused. I cannot help thinking that that must have arisen from a special sympathy with those receiving the aid. But when dealing with a Board School, then you must have a carefully devised system, so that no school which is receiving much money shall receive for the benefit of the ratepayers any subvention from the State. I do not think the whole matter has been treated on a basis which is just and fair all round. As my noble Friend said, these are merely two Bills for giving in one case a large dole and in another case a very small dole, and it is not in any way the establishment of any permanent portion of our educational system, except in so far as a larger sum of money will be spent in the promotion of education. I wish I could think it will all go towards efficiency, but I do not think it will. In some cases I think there are managers of Voluntary Schools as eager for good education as managers of Board Schools, and in such cases it will be applied for promoting the efficiency of a school, but in a great many cases it will go for nothing but the relief of subscribers. I dare say it has occurred to the noble Duke that there is to be a distinct premium under this Bill to have a low assessment. It is very well known that in many parts of the country assessments are by no means up to the real value of the property; now there will be a distinct encouragement under this Bill to make the assessment as low as possible, because then there will be a higher rate in proportion, and the parish in that situation will get relief which probably if it assessed itself at the fair amount it would not. I entirely disagree with the Bill except in so far as it gives a small assistance to certain School Boards, an assistance which, I venture to say, would not have been given unless there had been considerable pressure on the Government not to leave the Board Schools entirely out in the cold. ["Hear, hear!"]

Bill read a Second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

*The Earl of MAYO moved, "That this Bill be now read a Second time." His Lordship explained that the Bill was to afford facilities for the establishment and development of industries in Ireland. He trusted that those who were interested in Ireland would support a Bill of this kind. ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill consisted of 14 clauses; it had been before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and had passed without opposition. The promoters proposed to take any water or water rights, or any land in connection therewith, and it was not proposed to take land except in connection with water. To work these industries water was to be used. Such water was intended to be used for producing electricity, provided its employment for such purpose would not injure the water power used for any existing mill, or the water supply of any city, town, district, or locality; that the proposed industry was not of a nature to cause pollution to any stream or river; that any land to be taken was principally barren, uncultivated, or mountainous; that no fishery of any substantial nature should be injured by the undertaking; and that the establishment of such industry would be of general or local advantage. Subject to these provisions, the Local Government Board might, after an inquiry had been held, make an order giving a provisional approval to the application, and such provisional order should be published in the prescribed manner. An order under this Act might contain provisions consistent with the Act for the incorporation, with the necessary modifications, and subject to such exceptions and variations as might be mentioned in the order, of any of the provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts, and of the provisions contained in the Second Schedule of the Housing of the Working Classes Act 1890, and of the provisions of the Waterworks Clauses Acts 1863, with reference to security reservoirs; provided that nothing in the section should authorise any variation of the provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts, as amended by the provisions contained in the Second Schedule of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts 1890, with respect to the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement. Then there was another clause with regard to security for costs, which was very important:—

> "No order under this Act shall be made unless the prescribed sum has been lodged or secured within the time and in the manner prescribed to defray the costs and expenses of the Local Government Board and of successful objectors, and to render any works constructed in pursuance of this Act innocuous in the event of the undertaking being abandoned or the promoters becoming bankrupt or (if a company) being wound up, and such sum may be disbursed or released in such manner as may be prescribed."

He hoped their Lordships would support the Bill, because it would encourage other industries than agriculture, and would bring money into the country. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE EARL OF ARRAN said he was loth to oppose a Bill introduced in the cause of industry in Ireland, but he thought the principle underlying it was not appreciated. The principle underlying the Bill was that private companies and private individuals were to have compulsory powers to acquire land for the purpose of manufactures for private gain. That principle had never been sanctioned by Parliament. In his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, Sir Courtenay Boyle said that there was absolutely no instance of such powers being granted to private companies. If this principle were to be sanctioned for the future it should be brought forward in a Bill introduced by the Government, and even then it would be of the utmost importance that such a Bill should be most carefully weighed before such an invasion of private property was sanctioned. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE EARL OF DENBIGH thought it would be well for him to state at once what the position of the Government was with regard to the Bill. In the first place, it was not in any sense a Government Bill, but inasmuch as it went before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, on which prominent members of the Government Party in the House of Commons sat, and inasmuch as several Amendments were introduced at the instance of the Attorney General on behalf of the Government, the Bill had the sympathies of Her Majesty's Government. They believed that if it passed it would be a useful Measure, and that the harm which some noble Lords seemed to think would result from it, would not really come to pass. Considerable care had been taken to introduce safeguards which the Government believed would be amply sufficient, but if their Lordships thought otherwise he did not think there would be the slightest objection to consider further safeguards. The object of the Bill was to promote industries in Ireland which might be said to be dependent on electrical power. Although the Government could not deny the fact that the Bill introduced a somewhat novel principle, still in view of the fact that Ireland was, perhaps, an exceptional country—["hear, hear!" *and laughter*]—and that all classes were now doing their utmost to promote industries there, he thought their Lordships might, perhaps, overlook that novel principle provided that proper safeguards were introduced for the purpose of preventing any abuse of its provisions. He could only say that the Bill was believed to be a useful one and Her Majesty's Government hoped that it would pass.

*THE EARL OF MORLEY (CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES) trusted that he would not be accused of attempting to discourage industry in Ireland if he expressed his strong sympathy with the views of the Earl of Arran. ["Hear, hear!"] This Bill had a very innocent and almost frank appearance, and he must confess that until his attention was called to it, he had no idea that it contained the principle they had heard explained that night. He had looked in vain for the safeguards of which the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading had spoken. This Bill went against every one of the principles that had hitherto been observed by Parliament in the granting of compulsory powers of purchase. In the first place, with very few exceptions, compulsory powers were only given by Parliamentary Committees before which the opponents had the right to appear. That was almost, though not quite, the invariable practice. The second condition was invariable—namely, that no powers of compulsory purchase under the Lands Clauses Acts should be given, except for a public undertaking, in which the public at large had a distinct advantage to gain—["hear, hear!"]—and in all cases, without exception, provisions were carefully made that the public should reap advantage from any undertaking sanctioned. The third condition, which was not absolutely universal, but almost so, was that compulsory powers should be given only to public companies established under the Companies Clauses Acts and incorporated by Act of Parliament. The reason of that was that Parliamentary companies were subject to certain restrictions and conditions, one of which was that the undertaking which the company promoted was for the public advantage, the public advantage being paramount to the advantage of the company or its creditors. Moreover, no Parliamentary company was allowed to raise a loan on its property, so that no public undertaking could be stopped. It must be carried on for the public advantage. Thus it would be seen that in all cases the public advantage was the reason for giving compulsory powers. ["Hear, hear!"] In the case of individuals and limited companies, compulsory powers of purchase were only given for the purpose of improving communication in towns, sanitary improvements, the widening of streets, or matters of that kind; and he was quite certain that to give to a private undertaker these compulsory powers for his own private gain was absolutely unprecedented. ["Hear, hear!"] Every year all the large railway companies brought forward omnibus Bills, which almost invariably contained provisions for the construction of branch lines, and it was his duty to inquire whether those branches were really for the public advantage, or to serve a private manufactory or a coal-pit. If the promoters said they merely concerned a private undertaking, it was his duty to refuse compulsory powers of purchase, though not to refuse powers of construction. He did not for a moment wish to go into the details of the Bill, but it seemed to him to contravene all the principles he had stated as guiding Parliamentary practice at the present time. ["Hear, hear!"] The Bill proposed that the requisite powers should be granted by the Lord Lieutenant in Council. No doubt the Lord Lieutenant in Council was an excellent tribunal, but it was a question whether powers of that kind should be transferred from Parliament to another body, however distinguished. ["Hear, hear!"] In Clause 2 there was a curious provision that the power was only to be used for the purpose of producing electricity. Why on earth should the power not be used where water power was to be used directly? ["Hear, hear!"] Clause 3 provided that no land was to be taken unless it was principally barren, uncultivated, or mountainous. That was rather ambiguous; but that did not in any degree detract from the value of the water power. ["Hear, hear!"] The last provision was that the establishment of an industry under the Bill should be of general or local advantage. Was there any value in that qualification? He assumed that any industry was of local advantage, and he would be extremely sorry if any action of his tended to discourage local industry; but to say that it must be proved that an industry was of local advantage was an utterly futile and worthless condition. It was curious to find in the second Subsection of the clause that the Local Government Board, who were to issue this order, which was to be final, were not to be bound by the conditions which he had just mentioned. They were to have the power—in any case where they thought they could exercise it without public or private injury—to dispense with those conditions and to make the order absolute upon the private individual. Clause 7 gave promoters power to conduct their pipes—it did not say for what purpose, but he supposed it was for hydraulic purposes—in or through any land or road, and to divert any right of way, and to alter or reconstruct any bridge, provided that the change did not cause any serious inconvenience to the public. Surely a provision of that kind would be likely to cause great injustice and great inconvenience. ["Hear, hear!"] He thought he had said enough to show how greatly this Bill encroached upon the principles and rules respected hitherto by Parliament. He objected to big principles being dealt with in this fragmentary and piecemeal fashion. If

Parliament wished to alter the application of the Land Clauses Acts let it do so by all means, but let the change be effected by a properly considered Measure based upon some ascertained principles. But if they now passed a Bill of this kind applying to electricity, they would inevitably have to pass another very soon applying to other industries, and so they would have to go on. To deal with these large and important questions in this fragmentary manner would not be creditable to Parliament. In his opinion the importance of the objects of the Bill was not commensurate with the importance of acting in contravention of what had hitherto been the invariable practice and recognised principles of Parliament.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS observed that Lord Denbigh, speaking on behalf of the Government, had given reasons for supporting the Bill, one of them being that this was an exceptional Measure. He hoped that English and Scottish Peers would appreciate the value of that argument. It had been heard before in 1870 and 1881, and they might feel sure of this—that whatever Irish Measure they passed as an exceptional Measure to-day would be applied to themselves to-morrow. Lord Denbigh had told them that the Bill had the support of the Government, and he wished to ask the noble Marquess whether a Measure which had been shown to be objectionable by the Chairman of Committees really had their support, and had been considered by the Cabinet?

THE PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My noble Friend Lord Denbigh distinctly stated that this was not a Government Bill.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: He said that it had the support of the Government.

THE PRIME MINISTER: No, the sympathy of the Government; and the sympathy of the Government is, I think, precisely what it deserves. It does not deserve much more. [*Laughter.*] I mean that the intentions of the promoters of the Bill are admirable, and the object which it has in view of setting up industries in the more desolate parts of Ireland, and especially the object of putting to useful purposes the splendid water power that exists there, are admirable objects, and for them I have the deepest sympathy. But I confess that this beautiful spirit has been embodied in a less admirable frame, and, after listening to my noble Friend who sits at the Table, and whose authority we all regard so much, I am compelled to say that the Bill appears to me to have defects. [*Laughter.*] I do not think, though legal care was devoted to its preparation, that sufficient regard was paid to the consequences that might follow from some of its enactments. After the speech of my noble Friend the Chairman of Committees, I do not think the House ought to pass the Second Reading of this Bill. We trust to him, and never in vain, to guard our proceedings and to take care that important principles of property and legislation are not transgressed in Bills that are brought before us. I think, in the circumstances, it would be wiser not to press the Bill to a Division.

*THE EARL OF MAYO observed that Lord Morley, after saying he did not wish to discourage industries in Ireland, proceeded immediately to tear to pieces this Bill for the encouragement of such industries. The scope of the Bill was really very small. Its promoters did not ask for the use of the fat land of Ireland. They only wanted a few places in the mountains, where there was strong water power, which could be used for industrial purposes. Of course, sneers and ridicule were likely to kill any Bill. No comparison could be drawn between the case of Ireland and the case of England in matters of this kind. In Ireland there were tracts of country where land could be got for nothing, and where nobody lived, but the use of this land and the water could not be obtained without special powers, and it was for these necessary powers that the promoters of the Bill asked. This subject would be heard of again and again, and he should look to their Lordships to assist in removing any defects in the Measure, so that the promotion of industry in Ireland which would do so much good to the country might go on. After what had been said by the Prime Minister and the Chairman of Committees he realised that it would be useless to attempt to proceed with the Bill, but it was with the greatest reluctance that he withdrew it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn; original Motion and Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

LORD PIRBRIGHT, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, explained that it was necessary, in order to enable rules to be made for preventing collisions in the sea channels leading to the River Mersey. The Bill, which came from the other House, consisted of only one clause, which proposed to enact that the powers conferred by the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, should extend to and include the power to make rules concerning lights and signals in the sea channels or approaches to the Mersey.

Read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

APPEAL IN CERTAIN CIVIL MATTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Bill read a Third time, and passed.

LAND LEGISLATION (IRELAND).

*LORD INCHIQUIN rose to call attention to the effects of land legislation in Ireland during the last 30 years on owners and occupiers, and to move:—

> "(1) That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when, in the interests of justice, some compensation should be granted to landowners for the rights of which they have been deprived by the State; (2) that some relief might equitably be afforded to landowners, by granting State loans, on the same terms as those given to land occupiers, to facilitate the purchase by the landlord of the tenant-right or goodwill of the occupier, where he is willing to sell such interest, or for any other purposes sanctioned by Parliament."

He said that for various reasons he had been compelled to defer bringing this question forward until then, and even then he was afraid that the time was considered to be somewhat inopportune by some of those whom the Irish landlords looked upon as their friends and supporters in that House. But it seemed to him that the fact that the Government had conceded a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration of the Land Acts was no reason why he should not propose this Motion for compensation to the landlords for the injuries which had been inflicted upon them. His Motion dealt almost exclusively with the past, but, of course, it did not follow from that that they would be debarred from making a still larger claim in the future if the course which had been pursued lately by the Land Commissioners were permitted to continue. In fact, it was all the more necessary to proceed with this Motion at the present moment, seeing that the Government had refused to stay the hands of the Land Commissioners pending the result of the inquiry which was to be held. He feared that in order to put his case clearly before the House, he must go back over old ground and refer to the Irish land legislation of the last 30 years. Since 1870 no less than 25 Acts of Parliament had been passed dealing with land in Ireland. These Measures might be divided into two classes. The first class dealt with the questions of tenure, rent, and sale of holding, and the second class dealt exclusively with the question of purchase. It might be said generally that every one of those 25 Acts had been passed in the interest of the tenants. He called their Lordships' attention first of all to the Act of 1860. That Act introduced for the first time in Ireland a system of free contract. Under that Act the landlord could deal with his tenant as he pleased; he could turn him out on giving six months' notice to quit where a year's rent was due either from a tenant under lease or from year to year. At the termination of a lease the landlord could take the land into his own hands without paying compensation. It was clear, therefore, that the tenant had no power to sell his interest, because if he attempted to do so the landlord could immediately defeat the sale by serving a notice to quit. The Act of 1870 interfered for the first time with the rights of the landlord. Roughly stated, the Act of 1870 legalised the Ulster custom, and it gave compensation for disturbance on a graduated scale through the rest of Ireland. It also provided that any improvements made by the tenant were to be paid for. The next Act was that of 1881, which included fair rent, fixity of tenure, and free sale. Those were the critical points which had damaged the landlord's interest and had obliged landlords to come to Parliament and ask for compensation for the loss sustained. Fair rent practically meant perpetuity of tenure and a lease renewable for ever. The tenant also got the power to sell his interest at the highest price which he could obtain in the market; and it was this combination which had brought the landlords into the position they were now in. The next Act was that of 1887, the principle of which was passed by a Conservative Government. For the first time it broke leases and solemn covenants entered into by men perfectly competent to make agreements. Next came the Act of 1891, which brought in long leases extending over a large number of years. There was another Act at this time which gave the power to a tenant who had been evicted to resume his holding in certain circumstances. In 1896 an Act was passed which brought in large graziers, men supposed to be well able to protect themselves, up to a valuation of £100 a year. It also took away rights and privileges from the landlords—water rights, turbary, seaweed, and sea sand. It also prevented the landlord from having the power of redemption, which was one of the things which Mr. Gladstone specially reserved in certain circumstances. In 1885 came the Purchase Act, known as the Ashbourne Act. For the first time the tenant under it could borrow the whole of the money from the State for the purchase of his holding under an annuity of 4 per cent. for 49 years. The consequence had been that the whole of the money was promptly taken up, and a short time afterwards another Bill was brought in for the purpose of extending the amount of this purchase-money. This legislation had placed the tenant in this position—he could not be disturbed as long as he continued paying rent renewable for ever; he had the power to dispose of his farm for the best price he could get, and he purchased with State money the fee of the land. It might generally be thought that the tenant should be perfectly happy after all these things had been done for him, but he was afraid that was not the case. And the reason was obvious, because unless the man were in occupation before the Act of 1881, he had had to pay since that date large sums in order to get into his holding. These large sums had lately been very largely increased, and the consequence was this, that the interest of the money, which the tenant had to pay for his tenant right in coming into a holding, together with the reduced rent, very nearly amounted to his old original rent. What the Irish landlords said was this: You have reduced our rents, you have taken a large slice out of our property and handed it over to the occupying tenant, who is at liberty to go wherever he likes with the money. That was what Parliament had done. It had handed over to the occupying tenant the difference between the old rent and the judicial rent. He would take in illustration a peculiar case which happened upon his own estate just after the Act of 1881 was passed. He happened to put a tenant into a farm a year before the Act came into operation. The tenant was to pay a rent of £150 a year. He had not paid a farthing for that, because tenant right did not exist in the south of Ireland, and as regarded his own estate, it was especially guarded. The tenant asked the rent to be reduced to £130. He asked to be allowed to sell and he was allowed to sell. The result was that he got £1,250 for his interest, having come in the year before without any interest whatever. This man walked off to America or somewhere else with his £1,250, and left the present tenant subject to the rent of £130 plus interest on £1,250, which, he was bound to add, the tenant was paying very regularly. Now that man was going into Court, and the question would arise—What would the Land Commission do? Would they take that man's interest into account or not? If they did, it would be taken absolutely out of the landlord's property and nowhere else. Numerous cases of the same kind could be cited. Mr. Healy stated the other day that in the large farms of £100 a year and approaching it, it was not the case that large sums were given for tenant right. But according to a Return which had just been compiled, this statement was not correct, there being a large number of cases above £100 where very large sums had been given. There was a case where a tenant applied to be allowed to sell his tenant right for £500. The landlord objected that £500 was too much, and exercised his right of pre-emption. On going to the Land Commission, however, that body fixed the amount which the landlord was to pay at no less than £800. He quoted from returns of sales

Lord Inchiquin.

on a number of different estates to show the enormous sums given for tenant right, representing 20 and 25, and even 40, as much as 40 and 44 years' purchase. Such were the enormous sums given for land which they were told was worth so little. He spoke as a large farmer, having had for a considerable time as much as 4,000 acres on his hand, and he asserted that while undoubtedly prices had fallen, they had not fallen to anything approaching the extent represented by the reductions made by the Land Commission, for the fall in prices represented only 10 per cent. Mr. Healy had stated that for every £1 of reduction the expenses to the country had been 19s. 6d. Adding the money spent by the tenant on lawyers and money-lenders, surely it would have been cheaper to the country to have spent the money on permanent relief to tenants, and left undisturbed property rights in the way that had been done. The landlord had been expropriated, and perpetuity had been given to the tenant. He had become a mere rent-charger, entitled only to an economic rent fixed by the State, whereas before 1870 free contract existed. Where before he would get from 25 to 30 years' purchase, he could now only get 15 or 20, and very often he could not sell at all. He had to pay high rates on his mortgages, and his powers of borrowing were practically done away with. Recovery of rent had been made more difficult than ever, and arrears had very largely increased, though allowances had been made. The landlord, besides, now had very heavy legal expenses. Landlords who before had never been obliged to go into Court, were now forced to go there. They had all the expense of the first hearing, and often of the appeal, which was entirely useless, as he knew. The landlord could no longer resume his land under any circumstances; his rents had been reduced by leaps and bounds, while the prices of tenants' right had been rising. Further, the landlord now had to pay the tithe rent, where formerly he was allowed to get it out of the tenant's rent. As to the Commissioners, if they were angels—and many of them were more like fallen angels—they could not possibly perform the task which Parliament had set them —that of fixing a so-called fair rent without any guidance at all. These men were let loose over the country to deal with an enormous mass of property, often without any previous knowledge, and simply judging in some cases from the smell of a stick which they had dug into the ground. That was no exaggeration, but fact. As Lord Dufferin had said, they were sent groping in the dark to find the intentions of Parliament. They could not do the impossible, and the only rent which it was possible to fix was the market rent. If any lower rent were fixed, some one, not the landlord, must get the benefit of it, but some one would still be paying the market rent. These questions would never be settled until there was a return to freedom of contract. One party or the other must be bought out, and he proposed that the landlord should have the same facilities for buying out the tenant as the tenant had for buying out the landlord. Surely Parliament did not wish to banish the landlords from Ireland altogether. Such a thing would be ruinous to the country, and the working people regarded the prospect with horror, for the landlords, and not the tenants, were the men who gave employment. The despised landlord, too, was still the constant adviser of the poor people in any difficulty. There must be one person, and one only, in ownership of the land. As to what the Commissioners were now doing, it was right that the attention of Parliament should be called to it. He had the latest returns as to the fixing of judicial rents. They came down to the end of February 1897, and covered 1,672 cases. The total original rent involved in these cases was £52,994; the valuation was £39,368; the rent fixed for the first term was £42,289, or a reduction of 20·2 per cent., and the rent fixed for the second term was £30,957, or a reduction of 26·8 per cent. The total reduction on the two terms was equal to 41·5 per cent., or one-quarter under the valuation on which the rates were paid. The original rent, £52,994, was, curiously enough, one-quarter above the valuation. Lord Dufferin had well said that "the landlords were being jockeyed out of their property." It was all very fine to talk about the fall of prices; but the fall in England had been far greater than in Ireland, where most of the land was grass land. Besides, in England the landlord could always resume his land

and farm it himself; in Ireland he could not. As to the Irish landlords not spending anything on their property, who could expect it with such constant inroads being made? They could have no hope of getting the money which they spent back again. Before the landlords were dealt with by the Act of 1881, they had a margin of not more than 50 per cent. to spend. The reduction made by the judicial rents amounted to 41·5 per cent.; so that the landlord was now left with a margin of 9 per cent., and in many cases the whole of his income had been swept away. Therefore he felt bound in honour as an Irishman and a representative of Ireland to come forward on behalf of the large number of people who were being reduced to absolute poverty, and to ask Parliament why nothing was being done to stop what was going on. He now came to an important matter. Mr. Gladstone clearly foresaw that the question of compensation would arise under the land legislation which he initiated in 1870. On asking for leave to introduce the Land Bill of 1870, into which he was asked to introduce "the three F's," Mr. Gladstone said, "Perpetuity of tenure on the part of the occupier is virtually expropriation of the landlord:" also "compensation would have to be paid for rights of which he would be deprived;" and he then went on to show that the occupier only would benefit by the proposed legislation. Speaking again on March 11, 1870, Mr. Gladstone said:—

> "If you value rents you may as well for every available purpose adopt perpetuity of tenure at once. It is perpetuity of tenure only in a certain disguise.

On May 19, 1870, Mr. Gladstone, discussing fixity of tenure and valuation of rents, said:—

> "If we believe these provisions would be beneficial to the country it would be our duty to give them compulsory force by legislative enactments; and to consider from what source we ought to provide compensation to the landlord for rights he now enjoys."

Mr. Law, the then Solicitor General for Ireland, speaking on the Bill of 1870, said:—

> "The property must be in some one, and if we were to secure the possession of the land and the enjoyment of the profit to the tenant and his successors for ever, subject only to a rent, we should in effect, no matter how we disguise it, transfer the property of the farmer to him and change the present landowner into a mere rent charger."

Lord Inchiquin.

Sir Roundell Palmer (afterwards Lord Selborne) speaking in March 1870, said:—

> "Fixity of tenure, which in plain English means taking the property of one man and giving it to another. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone) said, according to the principles of justice, if we transferred property in that way we must pay for it. No doubt, we may take a man's property, but in that case we must compensate him for it."

Sir R. Collier, the Attorney General for England, taking part in the same discussion, said:—

> "What does that mean but fixity of tenure —that is, that the landlord is to be deprived of his property."

Ten years later, Mr. Gladstone, in bringing in the Bill of 1881, said:—

> "If, as has been said, Parliament is about to invade the property of Irish landlords the question of compensation becomes a very serious one indeed, and one concerning which, if we are prepared to deal with it at all, we ought to speak in most decisive terms. If those classes, either or both of them, have a just claim for compensation in consequence of the manner in which their interests will be affected by this Bill, we are bound as a Parliament to give it to them."

Could any language in favour of compensation be plainer than that. On July 22, 1881, Mr. Gladstone also said:—

> "We, in 1869 (on the Disestablishment of the Church) provided that every holder of an advowson in Ireland should receive the full market price of his property. This we held to be the true principle on which compensation should be based, and this is the principle on which the question should be approached on the present occasion. If after experience should prove that, in fact, ruin and heavy loss is likely to have been brought on any class in Ireland by direct effect of this legislation, that is a question we ought to look directly in the face."

There was one letter he should like to read to the House. It was from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack (the Lord Chancellor) in reply to a letter from a landlord in Ireland, asking him his opinion on the subject of compensation. The noble and learned Lord wrote:—

> "Dear Sir,—As my words were not committed to writing, I cannot speak with absolute certainty as to what they were. But what I think I said was, that I could see no reason why Irish landlords should be excepted from the principle which was generally applied in all cases where State policy involved taking away something to which an individual had a right—that is to say, that compensation should always be given where, for State reasons, private rights were invaded."

He would also quote John Stuart Mill on compensation. The extract was quoted from "Principles of Political Economy."

> "The principle of property gives them (the landowners) no right to the land, but only a right to compensation for whatever portion of their interest in the land it may be the policy of the State to deprive them of—to that their claim is indefeasible. It is due to landowners and to owners of any property whatever, recognised as such by the State, that they should not be deprived of it without receiving its pecuniary value or an annual income equal to what they derived from it. If the land was bought with the produce of the labour of themselves or their ancestors, compensation is due to them on that ground. Even if otherwise, it is still due, on the ground of prescription. Nor can it ever be necessary, for accomplishing an object by which the community altogether will gain, that a particular portion of the community should be immolated. When the property is of a kind to which peculiar affection attach themselves, the compensation ought to exceed a bare pecuniary equivalent. The Legislature, which, if it pleased, might convert the whole body of landlords into fund-holders or pensioners, might, *a fortiori*, commute the average receipts of Irish landowners into a fixed rent charge, and raise the tenants into proprietors, supposing always full market value of the land is tendered to landlords."

The last extract he would trouble the House with was from Bentham's "Theory of Legislation."

> "The principle of security require that reform should be attended with complete indemnity. The interest of individuals, it is said, ought to yield to the public interest; but what does that mean? Is not one individual as much a part of the public as another? This public interest, which you introduce as a person, is only an abstract term—it represented nothing but the mass of individual interests. Individual interests are the only interests; take care of the individuals; never molest them; never suffer anyone to molest them, and you will have done enough for the public. I shall conclude with a general observation of great importance. The more the principle of property is respected the stronger hold it takes on the popular mind. Slight attacks upon this principle prepare the way for heavier ones. A long time has been necessary to carry property to the point where we now see it in civilised societies, but a fatal experience has shown with what facility it can be shaken, and how easily the savage instinct of plunder gets the better of the laws."

The Legislature had always granted compensation where Measures had been passed for the public good, and had imposed it on public bodies, companies, or the individuals to whom it had granted compulsory powers to interfere with property and vested interests. And this compensation was not limited to damage done, but extended to prospective, possible, or contingent damage or injury. In 1833 the West Indian slave owners were enormously compensated when slavery was abolished, although it was questionable whether there existed in the planters any right to the ownership of other individuals. Compensation was also promised by the Government recently in the similar case of Zanzibar. It was also given in 1869 under the Irish Church Act; in 1874 and 1878 under the Public Health Acts and Acts directing the slaughter of diseased animals; in 1882 under the Arrears of Rent Act; and in 1871 on the Abolition of Army Purchase. He did not propose to say what course the compensation should take, he left that to the Government, but he thought it should take a direct form. Of course, to those who had no mortgages on their estates what he proposed would not be very much relief, but to those who had it would be an immense relief. He saw no reason why advances should not be made to the landlord to pay off the charges with which he was saddled for no fault of his own, his income having been diminished by the State. The State would have perfect security, and they lent money upon much worse security to the tenant. He appealed to the House and to the country to consider the claim they now made; to consider it not only on account of men in the upper classes of life who were in a position like himself and those around him, but to consider what was the position of those who had been brought up, if not in the lap of luxury at least with every comfort around them. What position were they to be placed in? Were they to be destitute, and were their children to be left without education? Were their Lordships to fold their hands and say that political necessity obliged them to do this wrong, and that they would not put their hands in their pockets to assist these people? He would ask them to bear in mind the saying, "*Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*" [*Cheers.*]

LORD CLONBROCK said that, in view of the extreme importance of the speech of his noble Friend, he would move that the Debate be adjourned till Friday next.

Motion agreed to.

House Adjourned at Half-past Seven o'Clock, to Friday next, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 25th May 1897.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1894 (PAROCHIAL CHARITIES).

MR. STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): To call attention to the effect of The Local Government Act 1894, on Parochial Charities; and to move a Resolution—[*Tuesday, 15th June.*]

QUESTIONS.

BLACK WATCH REGIMENT (SUBATHU).

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether an outbreak of enteric fever has accrued among the Black Watch regiment at Subathu; whether the same regiment suffered severely from the same disease last summer in the same place; whether at that time the prevalence of the disease was accounted for by one of the reservoirs being infected with the particular bacillus which is associated with this disease, the water being found to be swarming with the characteristic microbes; what steps have been taken in the matter since last summer; and, if all precautions have been taken, what special advantages exist at this place that it should be maintained longer as a troop station?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): A fresh outbreak of enteric fever has, I regret to say, occurred among the Black Watch, which arrived at Subathu on March 24 last. A telegram from the Viceroy dated May 23 states that 18 cases have occurred, 14 of which, however, are believed to have been contracted on the march up from the plains. Two cases have resulted fatally. Every possible sanitary precaution has been taken, and a thorough bacteriological examination into the cause of the disease is being made. A scheme for improving the permanent water supply, involving the acquisition of land and springs, is being carried out; meanwhile the laying of a temporary pipe is nearly completed. Subathu, which is 4,500 feet above the sea, has a good climate, and is not usually unhealthy.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

MR. J.G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that for the year 1896 there were 94,477 cases of withdrawal by telegraph from the Post Office Savings Bank, for which the average cost was 1s. 3d., whilst there were 8,076 applications by telegraph for withdrawal costing on an average 9d. each, will he explain why, on the 4th instant, the Post Office intimated that withdrawal by the system which cost the depositor only 9d. met the majority of cases; and, in view of the fact that the reverse is the case, and that the more costly mode, or 1s. 3d. rate, was adopted in 94,477 cases as against 8,076 by the 9d. rate, will he state if the Controller of the Post Office Savings Bank is responsible to the Postmaster General for answers given in this House in regard to that institution; and, if not, will he state who is responsible?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): No occasion arises to give the explanation asked for by the hon. Member, as the statement which he assumes to have been made by me was not made. I said nothing about "the majority of cases." What I did say was that two telegrams were required only "in cases of urgent need, which are of rare occurrence." Even if all cases of withdrawal, whether by one or two telegrams, are added together, they only represent about 1 in 40 of the total withdrawals. I was responsible for the answer, based on the information supplied to me by the Post Office, which was quite accurate.

POST OFFICE GUIDE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, (1) whether he is aware that on page 121 of the "Post Office Guide" Harris is described as a money order and telegraph office; (2) is he aware that although there is a district of that name, there is no town or township named Harris; and (3) seeing that Tarbert is the town in Harris at which money order and telegraph business is transacted, will he have the "Post Office Guide" amended?

MR. HANBURY: Yes, Sir; I am aware both of the postal and the geographical facts alluded to in the first and second paragraphs of the Question. Harris has been the Departmental name of the Post Office in question for more than 40 years, and, as there is already a post town named Tarbert in Scotland, it would not be expedient, after all these years, to alter the name. To prevent misunderstanding on the part of the public there is an entry at page 205 of the "Post Office Guide" at the name Tarbert showing that Harris is the name of the Post Office there.

PARISH COUNCILS ASSOCIATION.

MR. R. T. HERMON-HODGE (Oxon, Henley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the auditor of the Headington (Oxon) district has refused to pass parish council accounts where a subscription of one guinea has been paid to the Parish Councils Association, and whether such subscriptions are legal or not; if legal, whether the Local Government Board will advise parish councils and public auditors to that effect?

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): I understand the Auditor of the district, which includes the Headington Union, has made a disallowance, not of a subscription to the Association referred to, but of a charge for more than one copy of a publication issued by that Association. I may, however, state generally, that the Local Government Board are of opinion that there is no legal authority for the payment by a parish council out of their funds of a subscription to the Association.

MR. HERMON-HODGE desired to ask whether the hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of making these subscriptions legal, in view of the great value of the information supplied by that Association to parish councils, which as a rule were in great need of advice?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The proposal of the hon. Gentleman would mean legislation, and I can give no undertaking as to this.

BATTALIONS ABROAD.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether there are now nominally 14 battalions abroad in excess of the number at home, as compared with 11 mentioned by him at the commencement of the Session; whether these figures exclude the new battalion of Guards, but include as at home the new battalion of Cameron Highlanders: whether the new battalions of Guards and of Cameron Highlanders have any existence except on paper: and whether the Government still consider that the absence abroad of an excess of battalions is only temporary?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): There are 14 more battalions of infantry abroad than there are at home, excluding the Guards. This reckoning does not include the new battalion of the Guards, but it does include as at home the new battalion of the Cameron Highlanders. About one-third of the Cameron battalion has been raised; but the extra men raised for the Guards have been applied to the augmentation of the battalion first for foreign service. I may remind the right hon. Baronet that it was contemplated that the formation of the new battalions would take three years. As regards the number of battalions at this moment employed abroad, I can only say that, under existing circumstances, the Secretary of State does not see his way to reducing the number.

COLLIERY ACCIDENT (POLESWORTH).

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to an inquest held at Grendon, near Tamworth, on a pit-boy named George Read, aged 17 years, who at the time of his death was a driver at the Hall End Colliery, Polesworth; whether he has observed that it was proved at the inquest that the boy had been at work for over 12 hours when he met his death after 7 p.m.; that he had been without food since mid-day; and that he had been engaged at work on the previous day from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m.; whether he is aware that these long hours are in contravention of an undertaking given by the same employers at an inquest on a previous fatal accident; and, whether he will take steps to prevent a continuance of these prolonged hours of labour for young persons in coal mines?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): My attention has been called to the death of this boy. The hours of his employment as stated in the Question are substantially accurate, and I also understand it is the case that the manager, on a previous occasion, when a lad was killed after working more than 15 hours, had promised not to allow young persons to work so long in future. There is no power under the existing Acts to limit the hours of labour of young persons above the age of 16, but in this case I trust that the censure of the coroner's jury, and the remonstrances of the Inspector will be sufficient to prevent a continuance of the practice.

TRAWLING (MORAY FIRTH).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, having regard to the fact that trawlers sailing under a Foreign flag, are, under the North Sea Convention, allowed to fish in the prohibited waters of the Moray Firth, whilst British trawlers are denied a similar privilege, will he state whether any steps are being taken to place Foreign trawlers under the same restrictions as British trawlers?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave to a similar Question from the hon. Member on April 26.

QUEENSLAND.

MR. J. F. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has seen a Dispatch from his predecessor the Duke of Newcastle, dated 18th August 1858, reserving to the Crown the right and the power of subdividing the territory then created into the Colony of Queensland, by detaching from it such northern portions as might in the future be found fit to be erected into separate colonies; and, whether the power thus reserved is still capable of being exercised by the Queen in Council?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I understand that the power of subdividing Queensland does not rest exclusively in the Crown, but that the authority of Parliament would be necessary.

SALMON FISHERY (CASHEN RIVER).

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that numerous complaints have been made by men engaged in the salmon fishery in the Cashen River and Shannon Mouth by the great injury caused in the estuaries by trawlers interfering with and taking salmon in their nets; what is the prescribed distance or limit at which trawlers should fish; and whether steps will be taken to give salmon fishermen some protection in future from trawlers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): There is no evidence that trawlers have been at work in these waters within the prescribed three-mile limit, but it is open to fishermen who may feel aggrieved to apply for a byelaw prohibiting this mode of fishing, and on receipt of the application the Inspectors of Fisheries will arrange to hold a local inquiry as soon as possible.

FOREIGNERS AS BRITISH PILOTS.

Mr. J. A. WILLOX (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether certificates of competency are granted to aliens enabling them to act as pilots in the channels and ports of the United Kingdom; if so, whether, considering the danger to national safety which might arise in case of war from foreigners being trained in the intricate navigation of our Home waters, Her Majesty's Government will take steps to prevent in future the certification of foreigners as British pilots in British waters?

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon): The objections on the ground of national danger to the granting of pilotage certificates to masters or mates who are aliens was very fully considered in 1888 by a Select Committee of this House on Pilotage. The Committee were of opinion that the granting and renewal from time to time of certificates to aliens should be continued, and I am not prepared to propose any alteration of the law on the subject.

TOKAT MASSACRE.

Mr. J. C. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office has yet received information as to the nature of the communication addressed by Sir Philip Currie to Tewfik Pasha in respect to the recent massacre of Armenians at Tokat; if so, will he communicate it to the House; and whether Sir Philip Currie complained of the inactivity of the tribunal at Tokat appointed to try the Mussulmans implicated in the massacre, and also called the attention of the Porte to the non-execution of the sentences already passed?

Mr. CURZON: We have not heard of the alleged representation or complaint made by Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople in connection with the Tokat Commission; nor has a reply yet been received to a telegram of inquiry which was addressed to him on the subject.

Mr. FLYNN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say whether the reply would be received on Thursday?

Mr. CURZON: I really cannot say when the reply will be received, but I will communicate it to the hon. Gentleman or to the House as soon as it comes.

ARMY RESERVE.

Captain GRICE-HUTCHINSON (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the regulations as to refunding deferred pay on rejoining the colours are to be relaxed in the case of men of the Army Reserve who may enlist in the new battalions of the Brigade of Guards; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of granting the same privilege to Reserve men who may be desirous of rejoining other branches of the service?

Mr. BRODRICK: The men of the Guards who are invited to rejoin the colours are those who were discharged at the end of their three years' engagement with the colours. Such men did not receive deferred pay and are therefore in a different position from other Reservists.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Galway, Connemara (Mr. W. O'Malley), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Executive contemplate increasing the powers of managers to admit more children to industrial schools, and to allow the capitation grant for such further increase?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No such change as that suggested in the Question is contemplated in the general system. Every application for an increase in numbers is considered on its merits.

POST OFFICE PROSECUTION.

Mr. G. LAMBERT (Devon, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received from the inhabitants of Chulmleigh, Devon, a petition praying that a portion of the heavy law costs inflicted on Miss Adella Ford in vindicating her innocence of the charge brought against her by the Postal Authorities at Exeter, on 21st November 1896, may be paid to her by the Postmaster General; and, if so, whether the Postmaster General will be good enough to favourably consider such petition?

Mr. HANBURY: In February the Postmaster General received a petition from the inhabitants of Chulmleigh praying, *inter alia*, that some payment might be made to Miss Ford as compensation for the expense to which she had been put in connection with her trial. The Postmaster General gave very careful consideration to the petition, and with great regret came to the conclusion that he could not comply with it. The petitioners were answered accordingly. I do not know whether the hon. Member is aware of the admitted facts in this case; but I shall be glad to show them to him for his own information.

MILITIA OFFICERS.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Government propose to take any special action to fill up the large number of vacancies in the ranks of officers in Militia regiments?

Mr. BRODRICK: It has always been found that the admission of Militia subalterns to commissions in the regular Army has stimulated candidature for the Militia. With this view, additional commissions in the infantry and the artillery have been thrown open to Militia candidates. It is also in contemplation to offer advantages to subaltern officers who quit the Army if they will serve for a term in the Militia.

CAPE GARRISON.

Major RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, whether the batteries recently ordered to the Cape were on the First Army Corps, or higher establishment, with a regulation strength of 180 men and 86 horses, and supposed to be fit for service as they stood; whether 272 horses and 189 men were drafted into them; and why, if the Field artillery has been increased to an extent sufficient for three army corps, this was necessary?

Mr. BRODRICK: The three batteries which have proceeded to South Africa were on the higher home establishment of 161 men and 86 horses; and required according to the foreign establishment, which is practically the war establishment, 27 men and 156 horses to complete. Unfortunately, owing to the recent slackness of recruiting, they were considerably under the establishment of men, and this with the ordinary casualties, made a transfer of 189 men instead of 27 men necessary. In addition they had 116 horses perfectly fit for home duties, but which from age were less adapted for foreign service. These were exchanged with batteries at home for more suitable horses. Our batteries, like those of all other nations, are during peace on the peace establishment, and if required on any serious emergency would be raised to the necessary strength by calling out the Reserve.

SCIENCE TEACHERS.

Mr. W. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the relative numbers of English, Irish, and Scotch teachers engaged in the short courses of science teachers in July last year; and whether he will arrange that a due proportion of Irish teachers will be afforded this opportunity of obtaining the latest knowledge on various subjects next July?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: My right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education has kindly supplied me with the information necessary to reply to this Question. All the applications for the Summer courses received during the past two years have been sent to the inspectors, and practically every eligible

Irish teacher recommended by the Inspector has been admitted. The numbers admitted in 1896 from England and Wales were 121, from Scotland 56, and from Ireland 13.

FRANCHISE ACTS 1885.

MR. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that under the scale fixed by the Privy Council, clerks of unions and poor rate collectors are paid for the labour involved in issuing the requisition forms under the Franchise Acts of 1885, and as in a number of unions in Westmeath, Longford, Roscommon, and Sligo it has been found unnecessary to issue these forms, as involving useless expense, he will direct the auditors of the Local Government Board to surcharge payments made under this head?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The scale, according to which clerks and collectors of poor rates in unions in Ireland are paid for duties discharged by them under the Representation of the People Acts, is fixed by the Local Government Board in accordance with the provisions of 53 and 54 Vic., cap. 58. The service of the requisition forms under these Acts, is carried out in accordance with Statute, and the auditors would, therefore, have no legal power of surcharging payments made in accordance with Statute.

COLONISATION BOARD (MANITOBA).

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether there is any objection o stating the nature of the application made to the Colonisation Board on behalf of the Crofters' settlements in Manitoba?

*MR. H. T. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews Burghs, on behalf of the LORD ADVOCATE): My right hon. and learned Friend regrets that he is not in a position o give the exact information asked for y the hon, Member as communications n the subject are pending, and any xplanation given at present would only e misleading.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the ecretary of State for the Home Department (1) whether he is aware that there are numerous old buildings along the route of the Jubilee Procession, and that it is proposed to crowd the roofs and front rooms of these buildings to their utmost available capacity; and (2) whether there is any public authority invested with powers of regulation and control in this connection?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I have no definite information as to the point raised in the first paragraph of this Question. There is no law, of course, to prevent persons inviting as many guests as they like to their own houses; but the County Council, with whom I have been in communication, have considerable powers in regard to dangerous structures, and are quite alive to their responsibility in the matter. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the attendants of the House are to be provided with seats to witness the Jubilee Procession; and, if not, whether he will reconsider the matter with the view of giving the same accommodation to the attendants as is already provided for the clerical staff and the Press?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I can only refer the hon. Member to an answer which I gave last week to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Camberwell, on this subject.

MR. R. K. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the decision of Judge Addison, in the Southwark County Court, in relation to the eviction of tenants on the line of route of the Jubilee Procession; and whether, in view of the special circumstances surrounding the occasion, he will introduce a Bill to postpone until after 22nd June all proceedings on processes where no more than one month's rent is in arrear at the date of the receipt of the notice?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I have seen a report of the cases in the Southwark County Court. It would be a serious matter, in my opinion, to interfere with the ordinary law in the way which the hon. Member proposes; but the Judge, in giving judgment for the plaintiff, has power to fix the day on which execution shall issue, and in a case of real hardship I have no doubt he would use that power to name a day subsequent to the Jubilee.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what arrangements have been made for the attendance of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on Sunday, 20th June, in commemoration of the Accession of Her Most Gracious Majesty?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. Friend, I have been in communication with Mr. Speaker on the subject, and hon. Members who desire to attend the services will have to be good enough to enter their names in a book in Mr. Speaker's Secretary's office. The service will be at 11.30, and those Members who desire to accompany Mr. Speaker will have to assemble at the House at 11.15. I am not in a position to make any further statement at present, but detailed information will be published to Members as soon as possible.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of the fact that the Court of the Edinburgh University states that their resources do not admit of any expenditure on the preservation of the Library Buildings, will he consider the advisability of providing an additional grant to enable them to restore the Library, so that the Library may present a decent and cleanly appearance not only to the Jubilee visitors but to the numerous Scotsmen who visit the capital of their native country?

MR. HANBURY: No such application has reached the Treasury either through the Scottish Office or direct, and I do not suppose that the University authorities can contemplate any such appeal to the taxpayer. The Scottish Universities already receive a grant of £42,000 a year in full discharge of all their claims on public funds, and I cannot hold out any hope of further assistance for this purpose.

Sir Matthew White Ridley.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state the number of postal telegraph offices in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales respectively at which money order business is not conducted; and will he also state the number of money order offices in each of those countries at which telegraph business is not transacted?

MR. HANBURY: The number of postal telegraph offices at which money order business is not transacted is as follows:

England and Wales ...	323
Scotland	191
Ireland	33
Total ...	547

which is what I stated on Thursday last. The number of money order offices at which telegraph business is not transacted is as follows:—

England and Wales ...	4,151
Scotland	227
Ireland	367
Total ...	4,745

While money order business is usually carried on at all telegraph offices, it is not of course the case, as the hon. Member seems to assume, that telegraph business is usually carried on at all money order offices.

LIGHT RAILWAYS (IRELAND).

CAPTAIN DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. J. P. FARRELL), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when he hopes to be in a position to lay before the House a statement of the allocation of the sum voted last Session for the construction of light railways in Ireland; and can he state will any balance remain for application to other than the localities he has already selected?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I hope to be in a position to make a statement as to the allocation of the sum provided by the Railways (Ireland) Act of last year when the Vote for the Board of Works is under discussion. A margin is being left for contingencies, but no funds would be available for application to fresh schemes at present.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT 1887.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Cavan, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he can state the number of notices under the seventh section of the Land Act 1887, served in county Cavan during the year 1896, and the number served from January 1 to May 1, 1897; and whether he can state the number of persons actually dispossessed during the same period?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The number of notices referred to, served in County Cavan in 1896 was 220, and in the first four months of 1897, 78. There were 12 tenants and one sub-tenant actually dispossessed after service of ejectment notices under the seventh section, in 1896, and eight tenants dispossessed under the same section in the first four months of this year.

LAND COMMISSION.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that a very large number of applications have been made in Kerry to have fair rents fixed; and whether he can say when the Sub-Commissioners sat last, and about what time will the next sittings take place?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There are at present 286 applications to fix fair rent from the County Kerry awaiting disposal. A Sub-Commission was continuously at work in that county from September 1896, to the end of January. No date has at present been fixed for the next sitting of a Sub-Commission in the county.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the morning delivery of the mails at Youghal, county Cork, is considerably later under the new system than it was previously; and whether steps will be taken, either by improving the car service from Cork or by some other means, to give Youghal the advantage enjoyed by other Irish towns?

MR. HANBURY: It is the fact that since the 1st instant the morning delivery at Youghal has not begun until 7.45 a.m., or forty-five minutes later than formerly. The alteration has arisen from the later running of the night mail train from Dublin to Cork, one of the changes rendered necessary by the modification of the day mail services which took effect on the 1st instant. The question of accelerating the car service from Cork to Youghal is under consideration, with a view, if possible, of restoring at least some portion of the time which has been lost. The hon. Member shall be informed of the result.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACT 1895. (DOCK AND WHARF MACHINERY).

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has as yet taken any action under the Factory and Workshops Act 1895, section 23, sub-section I. (iv.) and (v.) which gives the Home Secretary power to make special rules affecting employment, and to make orders in regard to machines in docks, wharves, quays, warehouses, etc., and, if so, whether he will lay the rules made in accordance with the Act upon the Table of the House?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: As regards sub-section 4, which enables me to make rules for machinery or processes which are shown to be dangerous to life or limb, I have not as yet had any evidence which would enable me to pu this power in operation in docks or wharves. If any case should arise, I shall be ready to consider whether any effective rules can be made. The other sub-section has reference only to proceedings before magistrates with regard to particular machines that appear dangerous. I understand that the sub-section has not been found capable of general use in docks and wharves.

READING PRISON (DISCHAGE OF WARDER).

MR. M. DAVITT (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether a warder in Reading Prison has been dismissed the service for having given some bread to a youthful prisoner whom he found crying for food in a cell; and whether an ex-prisoner named Bell has been sentenced to 14 days and to have his ticket-of-leave cancelled, involving 130 days more imprisonment, for having thrown some cigar ends among some convicts at Borstall Prison; and whether he will consider the advisability of remitting or modifying the penalties inflicted in both cases?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: It is the case that a warder has been dismissed at Reading. The circumstances of the dismissal, of which the hon. Member appears to have received a very incorrect account, have been reported to me, and I am satisfied that the dismissal was fully justified. The ex-convict Bell has been convicted of the offence mentioned and sentenced to 14 days' imprisonment. The question whether his licence shall be revoked or not is at present under consideration.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORS.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the return of Local Government Electors, ordered 2nd March last, will be presented?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: The returns from five counties and three boroughs are still outstanding, and without these the return cannot be completed. I am doing my best to put pressure on the officers who are in default, and I will lay the return on the Table at the earliest moment it is in my power to do so.

RELIGIOUS ORDERS (IRELAND).

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government will introduce a Bill to remove the disabilities which prevent the clergy of religious orders wearing their monastic habits in public, and other religious disabilities affecting Roman Catholics which remain from the penal times in Ireland?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: This is a matter, as I have already intimated, for the consideration of the Statute Law Revision Committee.

CANADIAN FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Her Majesty's Government has approved the provisional agreement entered into between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and Messrs. Peterson, Tate, and Co., for the establishment of a fast Atlantic service; whether the representatives of any other firm or firms desirous of competing for the contract were fully considered before a final decision was arrived at; and whether it is in accordance with precedent for a new and important contract such as this to be determined by a secret agreement instead of by public tender?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Her Majesty's Government have, subject to certain conditions, approved the provisional agreement made between the Dominion Government and Messrs. Peterson and Tate. The representations of other firms were fully considered before a decision was arrived at. Tenders were called for as recently as last year, and as the only tenders received claimed a subsidy of half as much again as Messrs. Peterson and Tate, and as the firms who then tendered gave no indication of their readiness to provide a service fulfilling the advertised conditions on terms at all equal to those offered by Messrs. Peterson and Tate, Her Majesty's Government decided that it was unnecessary to call for fresh tenders.

DINGLEY TARIFF BILL (UNITED STATES).

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the Dingley Tariff Bill now before the Congress of the United States, and to the increased duty proposed to be placed by that Bill on salted mackerel and other cured fish: and whether Her Majesty's Government will direct that every possible representation will be made to the Government of the United States to prevent this large increase of duty, which would seriously injure the trade of the west coast fisheries of Ireland?

MR. CURZON: Her Majesty's Ambassador at Washington will be instructed to repeat the representations with regard to the proposed increase of duty on mackerel which he has already made to the United States Government with regard to a similar proposal concerning herrings.

CHARGE OF LARCENY (COUNTY TYRONE).

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.) : I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that two brothers named Maguire, county Tyrone, have stood four trials and are at present in gaol on a charge of larceny : and whether he can say if he intends again to put the Maguires on trial ; and, if so, will he give them the first opportunity of being tried, viz. at quarter sessions, which occur in a few days, and at which the cost of defending a prisoner is much ess than at assizes ?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. J. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) : The brothers Maguire have stood three trials, not four, as stated in the Question, two on the charge of murder and one for robbery from the person, on which latter charge they are still in gaol. It is the intention of the Government to put them again on their trial at the summer assizes, not before. I have, in answer to the questions of several hon. Members, already stated all hese facts to the House on more than one occasion.

POLICE PENSIONERS.

Mr. DALY : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of reland (1) whether he is aware that the rule which compels police pensioners to appear before a magistrate or clergyman, make an affidavit, and then go to the police barrack of the district, which s often six miles away, before getting their pension, acts hardly on men suffering from illness ; and (2) whether in uture he will have pensioners paid by heque delivered at their residences instead of having to call at the police barrack for the money.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR : In a case of sickness, the pension can be paid o another person authorised to attend at he barrack to receive it, and the uarterly declarations prescribed by Act f Parliament can be made by the nedical man in attendance on the sick erson, and not by a magistrate or clergyman only. Payment could not, I am nformed, be made in the manner suggested in the second paragraph.

CRETE.

Mr. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.) : I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Turkish troops in Candia have been authorised to make a sortie against the insurgents ?

Mr. CURZON : We are not aware that any such movement has been authorised, but it may at any time become necessary, in order to secure the water supply of the town, which is being perpetually attacked and cut off by the insurgents. The arrangement which has hitherto prevailed for the observance of a neutral zone by both parties, has been cancelled from to-day on a written request of the insurgents to the Admiral.

ARMY REMOUNTS.

Mr. FIELD : I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether large numbers of horses are being purchased in Buenos Ayres for military purposes ; and, whether it is intended to make any purchases in Ireland ?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.) : As has been explained already, the horses now being purchased in Argentina are for service in South Africa, for the climate of which they are believed to be more suitable, besides being much cheaper than horses bred in Europe. About 60 per cent. of the horses for the home cavalry are bought in Ireland ; and no change in the system is contemplated.

VOTERS' LIST (WESTMEATH).

Mr. DONAL SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the contract for the printing of the list of voters for the county of Westmeath has not been put up for public competition at the presentment sessions in accordance with the Grand Jury Acts and the decision of the Lord Chief Baron ; whether the contract for this year has been given away by the sub-sheriff in his private office, and if he can state at what price the contract has been given and to whom ; and, whether he will take steps that in future this contract will be decided in the way prescribed by Act of

Parliament at presentment sessions, and not in the private office of the Grand Jury official.

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: There is a grave doubt as to whether the Grand Jury are bound to advertise for tenders for printing, and in the county of Westmeath it has never been the custom to put up such contracts for public competition. If anything illegal has been done it is open to any ratepayer to traverse the presentment for this printing. The Quarter Sessions have no power in the matter. In the negotiations for such contracts the Clerk of the Crown arranges with the sub-sheriff to represent him.

LEWIS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the fact that the Post Office describes the Island of Lewis as only half an island, and that in the Reports issued by the Secretary for Scotland and other Government departments it is described as the Island of Lewis, will he state whether the Government contemplates altering the designation of the island?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir; the Government do not contemplate altering the designation of the Island of Lewis.

INDIAN BUDGET

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the great suffering caused by the Indian famine, and the serious questions raised by it as regards the future administration of India, the Government will bring the Indian Budget before the House at a time when a full attendance of Members may be obtained?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The hon. Gentleman is aware that the sympathy felt in this House with the sufferings of the people of India is very great, but I do not think that would necessarily produce a large audience for the discussion of the Indian Budget, whatever were the time of year selected for the Debate. I believe we have an example of the Indian Budget being discussed in June, and the audience was not greater then than it is when the Budget is taken at the usual time.

Mr. Donal Sullivan.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: There is a Question on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. J. P. FARRELL) which has not been asked. It is—What Votes in Supply will be taken on Friday?

MR. DILLON: Before the right hon. Gentleman replies, may I ask whether he can see his way to take Irish Supply on Friday next?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The suggestion that Irish Supply should be taken next Friday comes to me rather with surprise. I thought it was understood that English Supply was to be taken, and perhaps that would be the most convenient course. If it is English Supply, as I think it ought to be, the Votes I propose to take are the remaining Votes in Class I., excepting the Irish Votes, the remaining Votes in Class II., excepting the Foreign Office, Colonial Office, and Irish Votes, and if there be any opportunity, we should take Class VI., non-effective service.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): When will the Post Office Votes be taken?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I do not propose to take the Post Office Votes before Whitsuntide.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Is there any hope of the Scotch Estimates being taken within reasonable time?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I should be very glad to make an arrangement convenient to Scotch Members.

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMMITTEE (QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE).

MR. J. LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I rise, Sir, for the purpose of bringing under your notice a point of procedure which involves also a Question of Privilege. I desire your ruling as to what course ought to be followed by a Select Committee of this House, in the event of any information coming before it which reflects upon the conduct of a Member of the House, and in that connection I beg to call your attention to the Resolution passed upon the 16th of March

88—[*laughter*],—which is in the fol- wing terms :—

> "If any information come before any Com- ittee that chargeth any Member of the House, e Committee ought only to direct that the use be acquainted with the matter of such formation without proceeding further there- on."

wish to ask whether that Resolution still in force. I may be permitted to ld that I bring forward no particular stance or case, desiring only your ling as to the general practice which erates as regards Committees of this ouse.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution of 88, to which the right hon. Gentle- n has referred, is no doubt still part the practice and rules of the House. eed not refer more particularly to the olution, as the right hon. Gentleman read its terms. All I can say as to e course to be taken by a Committee is at when any case arises to which that le is applicable it is obvious that the oper course is to report to the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Considered in Committee. [Progress, th May.]

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, r. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair].

Clause 1,—

ABILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO WORKMEN FOR INJURIES.

1.) If in any employment to which this Act lies personal injury by accident arising out and in the course of the employment is caused a workman, his employer shall, subject as e nafter mentioned, be liable to pay compen- io in accordance with the First Schedule to s Act:

2.) Provided that:—

(a.) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least *two weeks* from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed;

(b.) When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury wrs caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act, except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

(3.) If any question arises as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies, or whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer, or of any person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, or whether the injury was caused by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment of the workman injured, or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, or otherwise as to the liability for compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement, shall, subject to the provisions of the First Schedule to this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the Second Schedule to this Act.

(4.) If the Registrar of Friendly Societies certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment is on the whole not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of this Act, the employer may, until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of those workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act, and thereupon the employer shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme, but save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act.

Another Amendment proposed [24th May], in sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words,—

> "(a) the employer shall not be liable under this Act to pay compensation to any workman by whose wilful and wrongful act or default the accident arises in respect of which compensation for injury may become payable."—*(Mr. Seton-Karr.)*

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—Debate resumed.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) pointed out that there were upon the Paper several Amendments somewhat similar to that of the hon. Member for St. Helens (Mr. Seton-Karr). This Amendment provided that the employer should not be liable to pay compensation to any workman by whose "wilful and wrongful act or default" the accident arose, but the Amendment of the hon. Member for

Chester-le-Street, to which the Colonial Secretary specially alluded in closing the Debate last night, raised the whole question of the misconduct of the workman. He wished to ask the Chairman whether he thought it would be for the convenience of the Committee to Debate the various forms of the Amendments upon the present Amendment, or to confine the present Debate to the words "wilful and wrongful act or default."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said it had been the custom lately when one Amendment raised a principle which was also raised by several other Amendments, although the principle was not stated in exactly the same terms, to discuss the principle generally on the first Amendment, and then, if the House accepted the principle of the Amendment, to consider the actual wording of the Amendment to be inserted. That would, he thought, be a convenient practice to follow on the present occasion.

*SIR C. DILKE said that the words "wilful and wrongful" undoubtedly restricted the Amendment to cases which were somewhat different from those suggested in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Chester-le-Street. If they had to choose between the form of the Amendments he should prefer the Amendment and the protection suggested by his hon. Friend the Member for Chester-le-Street. That Amendment raised the question of disregard of orders and the question of misconduct. He hoped to lay before the House some considerations opposed to these Amendments altogether. He confessed that they seemed to have limited the Bill by certain words introduced into it already, and which were likely to give rise to a good deal of litigation. The introduction of the principle which was now contended for in this Amendment, and still more the introduction of this principle in some of the milder forms suggested by some hon. Members, would open the door, he was certain, to a very large amount of additional litigation. They were engaged in discussing a Bill for which there was no precedent in this country, but which, in many points, touched questions which had been very largely discussed in other countries for years past. The particular point raised by this Amendment had been very fully discussed in Germany for years past, and it was one upon which there had been the greatest possible difference of opinion. When the first steps were taken towards the introduction of the compensation principle in Germany, the State officials were mostly opposed to suggestions such as this, but the employers were favourable to such suggestions. In Germany, the Committee would remember, all accidents were paid for unless they were caused by an act which might be almost described as an act of suicide. Dr. Boediker, the head of the German system, in a book which appeared last year, had brought into comparison the German system and the Austrian and Norwegian systems and the principal systems proposed for other countries, and had fully discussed this point. "For ten years," he wrote,—

> "we have given full compensation from the employer even where the accident is caused by the gross fault of the workman. The employers wish for no change on this point. If we are to stop or reduce that compensation in such cases, then we ought clearly to increase it in the case of gross fault of the employer."

This authority then went into the figures to show that a large percentage of accidents were the fault either of the worker or the employer, or, in part, of both, and said that the consequence of introducing this principle of fault into the consideration of compensation, either as regarded stopping the compensation or reducing it, would be to produce an enormous amount of litigation upon a point which was, in itself, a thing most difficult of ascertainment by the Court. Dr. Boediker concluded his survey of this matter with some general considerations which were, he thought, worth the attention of the Committee. He said the principle of compensation was the principle of social pacification, which ought to be accepted, and could only be defended on that ground, but that if they brought in this principle of stopping compensation or reducing it, exasperation instead of pacification followed. He used these words:—

> "To stop compensation in the case of gross fault of the worker is to throw a bombshell into the whole principle of compensation itself."

He also pointed out that the employers had now come to know that they would ave very little money indeed by the doption of the principle which was conended for in this Amendment, and while hey would save but very little money the doption of the principle would destroy he whole moral effect of the compensaion law which had been introduced. He vas quite aware that they could not rgue with regard to this Bill generally rom the example of Germany. The oundation of the German system was ifferent from the foundation of the sysem here, but he did submit to the Comnittee that as regarded this particular oint before them the experience of Gernany was material to the question the ommittee had to decide.

MR. C. A. CRIPPS (Gloucester, Stroud) aid he had put an Amendment on the aper practically in the same words as hat now before the Committee, and he hould like to explain why, both on the rinciple of justice and of expediency, he hought the Amendment should be dopted. He should first like to say, in nswer to the right. hon. Baronet oppoite, that in this particular Bill the aditional obligation which he referred to as placed upon the employer.

*SIR C. DILKE said he was quoting r. Boediker, who meant an increased, a enal, payment in addition to the rdinary compensation.

MR. CRIPPS said there was a penal ayment in this Bill. The advantage to n employer of this Bill was that, as gainst insurance, he had limited ability. If an injury were caused by the ilful or wrongful act or default of the mployer, he lost the limit of his liability nd he was liable at common law, not nly for the £150 or the £300, or whatver sum might be fixed in the Bill, but r such larger sum as the Jury or the ourt should award. Upon the point justice, really there seemed to be no spute, and he did not think there was ny reason to expect any of the diffiulties as regarded litigation or friction which the right hon. Baronet opposite luded. Was the Committee going to nction for the first time the principle at although a man might be criminally sponsible for his wilful and wrongful t, yet he was to be compensated either the employer or by his fellow worken? ["Hear, hear!"] A principle of at kind was necessarily inconsistent with justice. Supposing, say, an employé of a railway company acted in direct contravention of the rules which had been laid down, such as riding on an engine. Was he, because he suffered an injury as the immediate consequence of his neglect of rules, to cast the same obligation either upon the company or upon his fellow workmen? Take another illustration. A small employer was working with his workmen, and contrary to his direct instructions, a workman brought about, by his wilful and wrongful act, an injury which affected both the employer and the workman. Under this Bill the workman, who had thus brought that about would get compensation, and the effect would be that while the small employer would be ruined and have to go to the workhouse, the man who had caused the accident would be living in ease and comfort. He did not think it could be said that that was consistent with justice. As regarded the question of expediency, he said it was inexpedient to encourage a man to hope for compensation when an injury resulted from his own wilful and wrongful act. It was far more expedient to make him feel, not that he would be compensated, but that he must bear the necessary consequences which such an act had brought upon him. He thought that compensation under that Bill ought to go to the man who deserved it, and not to the man who had brought the injury upon himself by his own wilful, and probably his own criminal, act. He did not agree that the Amendment would tend to increase litigation. On reference to Sub-section 3 of Section 1 it would be seen that the question whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer was a question which the arbitrator would have to settle under the Bill as it stood. And if they adopted his own Amendment, to add after "employer" the words "or workmen," he could see no difficulty in the arbitrator deciding whether it was the employer or the workmen who had been in default. He denied, therefore, that there would be any tendency to increased litigation as the result of the Amendment. He went further, and said that justice required discrimination in a matter of this kind, and the machinery for discriminating properly must be provided. ["Hear,

hear!"] He pointed out that contributory negligence did not come in under the Bill at all. The workman had to establish the fact that he was injured in his employment, and it was then for the arbitrator to determine the amount of compensation and whether there had been any wilful and wrongful act on the part of the employer. There could not be any real chance of greater litigation because the arbitrator had this additional question referred to him. He submitted it was right that the question of the workman's default should be referred to him also, and he hoped, after the intimation the Government had given, that it would be possible for them to give way on this point. For himself, he would not assent without a Division, unless the Government would make some concession, to introducing for the first time into English law what he considered to be a thoroughly bad and vicious principle, viz., that they were to encourage a man to act wrongfully in order that he might be paid in respect of the injury that resulted. Although his own Amendment was not quite in the form of that of the hon. Member for St. Helens, yet he cordially supported it.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-street) said that if the Government were disposed to accept the principle of the Amendment now before the Committee, he should be content with any words that would carry out the principle. His right hon. Friend the Member for the Forest of Dean alluded to the fact that in Germany this question of eliminating accidents caused by the wilful default of those who suffered had been a cause of great difficulty. He confessed that to a certain extent he agreed with him. But the German system and the system proposed in this Bill were altogether different things. In the German system no compensation was paid until 13 weeks had expired, and by that 13 weeks a large number of the accidents caused by carelessness were eliminated, and the workman contributed to meet the claims arising within that period. He could not admit there was any great difficulty in compensating for all accidents, seeing that it was already done by all the Miners' Permanent Relief Funds, and very little litigation occurred. But he looked upon this Amendment as a much more important one than many hon. Members, for this reason—the Bill did not directly deal with safety. But the safety of the workers in our mines and our large industries should never be lost sight of when the House was legislating on a question of such importance. He held that if a workman in a mine wilfully broke rules and thereby caused an explosion, which not only injured himself, but probably a large number of his fellow workers, it would be a monstrous thing that the same compensation should be paid him or his family as to those who had nothing whatever to do with the cause of the explosion. To take a simple illustration. Certain rules were laid down for firing shots. The hole had to be made a certain depth, and a certain quantity of coal had to be taken out before the shot was fired in order that the shot might bring down the coal without difficulty. The workman refused to do that, but put in his shot without adopting the precaution of taking out the coal, and instead of the coal being brought down there was what was called a "blown-out" shot, which produced an explosion. Was there a Member of that House who would say it was just and proper that a man who showed such carelessness with such serious results should receive compensation the same as the other workers who were injured by his wilful neglect? He could not think there was any justice in that. Apart from justice, the question was one of safety. In his opinion, they ought at all events to throw the balance against the workman in favour of safety rather than in favour of the workman against safety. He felt that the Government, in accepting an Amendment of this sort, would confer the greatest advantage not only on the employers, but on the workmen employed in mines, because it would lead to greater care being taken, and thus tend to a large prevention of accidents. It was quite impossible for any employer to have perfect supervision over every workman. He cared not what the industry was, a great deal must always be left to the care and judgment of the workman himself; and they might depend upon it that an Amendment of this sort would lead the workmen to take greater care than at present, to his own advantage as well as that of his employer. He would not for a moment say that any workman would wilfully neglect proper precautions because he was sure of compensation whether he took those precautions or not; but he was sure it would have some weight, and believing that the Amendment would induce greater care, he hoped the Government would accept it.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I said last night that the Government were prepared to meet this question with an open mind, and would be very glad of any guidance the House could give in respect to it. ["Hear, hear!"] There are two questions to be considered—first, as to the principle of this Amendment; second, assuming the principle to be granted, as to the best means of giving effect to it. As regards the principle, I am entirely at one with the hon. Gentleman opposite and with the hon. Gentleman behind me. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not think it can be too seriously contended that it is not just or right that a man who deliberately and of gross negligence causes an accident, by which other people, perhaps, as well as himself are injured, should have the same compensation as he would be entitled to if the accident occurred irrespective of his own action. It would seem to be almost monstrous that, when stringent rules are laid down with regard to the firing of mines, and when workmen are required not to descend into mines with matches, or without locked lamps—I say in those cases the orders are distinctly and definitely given within the knowledge of every workman; and, assuming that a workman goes down with matches in his pocket, and, lighting a match in a fiery part of the mine, an accident happens by which three or four persons are injured, including the workman who took down the matches—I say it is monstrous to assert that the man has any right to compensation under circumstances in which he himself has been the agent in bringing about all the suffering and loss. ["Hear, hear!"] I am bound to say also, having regard to what has been impressed on us again and again, that we should at all events do nothing which would interfere with the prevention of accidents; and it certainly would seem absurd, as it were, to put a premium upon negligence which might cause accidents. We are, therefore, in accord with hon. Gentlemen in the principle they have laid down, and the only difficulty we have is as to whether, by accepting the principle, we might not introduce complications which would cause more injury and trouble than we should save by dealing with what is admitted to be a rather exceptional state of things. The Government have come to the conclusion that we cannot resist that some application of this principle should be accepted. [*Cheers.*] A great deal will depend upon the terms of the Amendment, for there are certain things which we must carefully avoid. We wish to avoid the bringing in again under another name of the old principle of contributory negligence. ["Hear, hear!"] We think it has been clearly and conclusively proved that the introduction of that principle into employers' liability has been the cause of the greatest hardships and injustice to the working people, and we must not, therefore, bring it in again by a side wind. ["Hear, hear!"] It is also necessary that we should have our words so simple that they are not likely to be the subject of material litigation. ["Hear, hear!"] I think I have gathered from all discussions on this question that employers, quite as much as workpeople, are anxious that litigation should be avoided, and both sides would agree that anything which increased unnecessary litigation would be a great misfortune. I do not think the words we are now considering would be satisfactory, nor yet the words of my hon. Friend behind me. I admit, although the words appear in the Bill in a different relation, that I do not think in this case they would avoid the probability of litigation. Wilful and wrongful default is always a matter of some dispute, and when we are dealing with cases of this kind we ought to try to make the clause a little more technical. I think the best framework for an Amendment is to be found in the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chester-le-Street, but even to that as it stands I think there are serious, or, at all events, plausible objections. The hon. Baronet proposes that the employer shall not be liable for compensation in the case of accidents which arise from the non-observance of any lawful orders. That is a very wide statement, and it would admit the possibility of an order being given which was intended to evade liability under this Act

—in fact, a sort of impossible order. An order might be given under which the ordinary work of an employer would not be satisfactorily carried on, and which, therefore, must be disobeyed, and which would only be nominally given in order to throw the risk upon the workman when it ought really to rest upon the employer. A sort of case which suggests itself is the case of shunting on railways. It is perfectly easy to make regulations and orders about shunting which would render that operation absolutely safe. But at the same time, if they were observed, shunting, which now occupies a minute, would take an hour, and the work of the railway could not be conducted under such regulations, and it would be understood—and, indeed, it is understood—that a bold and skilful workman does take upon himself a certain amount of risk. In all these cases the Bill intends that if an accident occurs to such a workman he shall be compensated notwithstanding any regulations to the contrary; therefore I say to allow an employer to clear himself from all liability under this Act by giving a lawful order—and, of course, all orders in this respect would be lawful—would, I think, give rise to a great deal of difficulty and would materially detract from the value of the Bill. I should, therefore, suggest that the hon. Baronet should strike out of his Amendment the words "the non-observance of any lawful order." I would suggest that the Amendment should run—

> "which arises from the wilful disregard of any rule or regulation contained in or established under any Act of Parliament which it was the duty of the workman to observe."

The Committee will see that that involves, first, that the rule shall be one which has already had the sanction of Parliament, and which, therefore, may be considered to be a reasonable and proper rule; and, in the second place, that there should have been wilful disregard. The hon. Baronet then proposes to add these words, "or to any other misconduct of the workman." Those words, again, are a little too wide, and I think we might insert in their place the words, "or to the drunkenness or other gross misconduct of the workman." That would be a modification which, I think, comes entirely within all the cases the hon. Baronet desires to include. I think if he were prepared to accept these modifications the hon. Member proposing the Amendment under discussion might withdraw it, and we might accept the Amendment of the hon. Baronet, altered in the sense I have suggested, as a new sub-section to Clause 1, and which would come in as the second sub-section just before that which deals with wilful and wrongful default. The words would then be to the effect that an employer would not be liable

> "for any accident which arises from the wilful disregard by such workman of any rule or regulation contained in or established under any Act of Parliament which it was the duty of the workman to observe, or to the drunkenness or other gross misconduct of the workman."

[*Cheers.*]

Mr. CHARLES FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) could not help expressing his regret that the Government had steadily refused to broaden the Measure in any sense or form, and that the Colonial Secretary, speaking on behalf of the Government, should have accepted a limitation such as was implied in this Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"] He entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman as to the justice of the case, and there was not a single labour representative in the House who would get up and defend a man having compensation for his wilful act on the ground of justice or equity. But he certainly thought that in accepting, even in its limited form, an Amendment such as this, the right hon. Gentleman had opened the door for endless litigation between employers and employed. ["Hear, hear!"] That one defence—for it was practically the only defence—which the Government proposed to set up would, in a large number of cases, if not in every case, be urged by the employers as a reason why compensation ought not to be paid. Assume that an accident had proved fatal and a workman had lost his life. Where were they to find witnesses except the official witnesses? They were the only witnesses that would be called in this instance to prove that the man had wilfully and negligently disobeyed some order and therefore had given rise to the accident. He was bound to say that the Measure became infinitely less valuable to the workmen when a provision such as was now proposed was inserted in the Bill. In the whole of his experience as a working miner, extending over close upon 30 years, he had never known a case where a man wilfully and deliberately injured himself or a colleague for the sake of any compensation that he would be likely to receive. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped it was not too late to appeal to those in charge of the Bill to withdraw from their position and refuse to accept the Amendment even in the modified terms suggested. If such a restrictive Amendment were adopted it would materially alter the views as to the advantage of the Measure which were now entertained by workmen in various parts of the country.

Mr. TOMLINSON (Preston) said that in reference to the mode proposed by the Bill for dealing with compensation for accidents, he had been an humble follower of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. When that right hon. Gentleman moved his Amendment to the Bill of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for East Fife (Mr. Asquith) in 1893, he limited it by the proviso that the compensation he proposed should not apply to injuries caused by the workmen's acts or defaults. That limitation was embodied in a Bill which had been introduced in more than one Session for dealing with accidents in that way, and it could not be a matter of surprise to any one that it should not be proposed that employers should be made liable to compensate a workman who had been injured by an accident caused by his own misconduct or by violating rules provided for his own safety. That was the object of this Amendment, and he felt bound to support it.

Mr. W. ABRAHAM (Glamorgan, Rhondda) expressed deep regret that the Government, by the acceptance of the Amendment even in a modified form, should have given the case of the miners away. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!"] He reminded the House that only 42½ per cent. of the fatal accidents in coal mines were due to explosives, whilst 57½ per cent. were due to falls of roof and side. In cases of the latter category the employers would be able to plead the "wilful and wrongful act or default" of the workmen and refuse compensation. It was very easy to theorise after the event and for employers of labour to find officials who would blame the dead man. The officials of the colliery would naturally defend the employer and say that it was the fault of the deceased that life was lost. Hitherto he had valued the Bill, but the acceptance of the Amendment would reduce the value of the Bill to the miners of this country 50 per cent. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] He asserted his opinion against every man in the House. ["Hear, hear!"]

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight), replying to the hon. Member who last spoke, said that, if he thought the acceptance of the Amendment would exclude compensation in anything like the large percentage of cases he had suggested, he would not have been a party to it.

*Mr. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) also regretted, in the interests of the miners of this country, that the Government had accepted the Amendment. Never yet did a blown-out shot cause an explosion where the condition of the mine was satisfactory. He denied that miners would receive any encouragement to do wrong. A miner's life and limb was as valuable to him as any hon. Member's. He had never seen the value of the Bill to the miners of the country, and the acceptance of this Amendment would greatly minimise the value of the Bill. All the efforts to extend the provisions of the Bill had been strenuously objected to, but when an attempt was made to restrict the effect of the Bill, the Government accepted it in plausible and illusory terms. From early youth until manhood he worked in the mines, and he had never known an instance of a man wilfully and deliberately injuring himself. The effect of the Amendment would be that, whenever an accident happened, an attempt would be made to fix the blame on the workman. The man would be mulcted in expenses, and the benefit of the Act would be delayed until the time for its usefulness was past. The process of the Bill was that if a Committee was formed in a district the appeal was to that Committee. If there was no Committee then the appeal was to be to an arbitrator or to the County Court Judge. Did the Government believe that the access to these courts would be ready and easy? They would be crowded with cases, and three or four months would elapse before a man would get the benefit of the Act. The time would be gone when the Act would be useful to him. It was no mere fantasy to say that a charge would be brought against a dead man for breach of the rules. He had seen it done. The officials of the employers were not all angels who spoke the truth at all times. Their prejudices were in favour of the employer, and they would not hesitate to make charges against the men of breaches of the special rules. He was sorry to hear gentlemen in the House make charges against workmen, not by implication or by indirect insinuation, but by direct statement. To suggest that for the sake of compensation a man would place his life in jeopardy was abhorrent to human nature, and a direct contradiction of the first law of existence, self-preservation. It was not by carelessness but by boldness that a man placed himself in danger and brought harm upon himself. Would anyone say that a man who did that should be deprived of the benefits of this Measure? ["No, no!"] But the effect of the Amendment would be to deprive him of these benefits. He hoped the Government would recede from the position they had taken up in reference to the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, with a view to putting the matter in order, moved to amend the Amendment of the hon. Member for St. Helens by leaving out all the words after the word "liable" and inserting the following words:—

"to pay compensation in respect of any injury sustained by any workman which arises from the wilful disregard by such workman of any rule or regulation contained in or established under any Act of Parliament which it is the duty of such workman to observe or from the drunkenness or gross misconduct of such workman."

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE (Burnley) thought they had some ground for complaining of the course the Government had taken with regard to the Amendment. The Colonial Secretary stated on a previous night that the Government in this matter would be guided by the sense of the House, and they met that day imagining that only after very full discussion would the Government make up their minds as to the action they would take. Instead of that, however, only two speeches had been made when the Secretary of State for the Colonies got up and announced the intention of the Government to accept an Amendment which he (Mr. Stanhope) regarded as almost fatal to the Bill. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman a little fact which might convey some information to him. He had himself the honour, as representing probably the largest weaving town in Lancashire, of meeting the representatives of the employers of the Lancashire cotton industry on the previous day, and in discussing the matter with them he took the view that had been taken by the hon. Member for Wansbeck and others in this Debate, and he was glad to say that amongst those gentlemen who represented the Lancashire cotton centres on the Government side of the House, so far as he could judge, there was a majority who did not take the view of the Colonial Secretary, and who did not believe that the Amendment would be a useful one to introduce. The principal merit of the Bill was that so far as was humanly possible it excluded litigation, and gave general compensation for accidents and death. To that extent it was an immense advance upon all its predecessors in connection with employers' liability. It was in fact not a lawyer's Bill, but a statesman's Bill. But when they came to the acceptance of this Amendment he was bound to tell the Government that by that acceptance they were about to destroy the whole value of the Bill. The sole argument adduced in support of the Amendment was that a man who by his wilful neglect or act caused an accident ought not to be allowed to receive compensation. But he would point out that the object of the Bill was not to punish but to make provision in cases of accident or death. He entirely agreed with those who thought that if there was one defect in the Bill it was its too limited scope, and that it ought to be applied to all trades. Now the Government had opened the floodgates of controversy, and if the Amendment were accepted he believed that means would be discovered of raising legal questions with regard to almost every claim for compensation. As the representative of a cotton industry, he agreed that the acceptance of this Amendment would destroy the whole value of the Bill. [*Opposition cheers.*]

Sir ARTHUR FORWOOD (Lancashire, Ormskirk) in supporting the Amendment moved by the Attorney General, said he did not think it would lead to litigation. In the Bill there was every encouragement to a workman to refer every question to arbitration, and if he did so he had everything to gain and nothing to lose. If the Amendment was introduced the question would go before the arbitrator with this additional consideration:—Was the workman himself guilty of misconduct that he had committed a breach of any of the rules laid down by Parliament? The workman, if he had been guilty in either of these respects, would hesitate to place the matter before the arbitrator, and would be more willing to settle by agreement. Therefore, this restriction, which was just in itself, would have the effect of preventing litigation.

Mr. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) very much regretted the attitude of the Government with regard to this Amendment. He admitted that the matter was one of great difficulty, but the introduction of the particular words now proposed would, in his opinion, involve a departure from the fundamental principles of the Bill. [*Cheers.*] If they opened the door to an inquiry into circumstances and conduct in one case they would have to do so in all. By the adoption of this alteration of the Measure the dangers of litigation would be greatly increased. In the case of coal mines the regulations and the instructions to miners were often of a very minute and complex character. He did not hesitate to say that experience had often shown these rules to be unfitted for special emergencies, such as were likely to happen in mines. Under this Amendment a workman who purposely violated a rule in the interest of the safety of those in the mine, and who himself sustained injury would not be entitled to compensation. Apart from these considerations, who could say what was "gross misconduct?" He defied any lawyer to lay down any standard in the matter. And the special reference to drunkenness he considered unnecessary, and in the highest degree offensive. He hoped the Government would abandon their intention of endeavouring to meet what, after all, would be a trifling number of cases, and that they would decide to deal with the question on broad grounds of general policy. ["Hear, hear!"]

Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) denied that the Amendment was a departure from the principle of the Bill. He believed that it removed an injustice, and that that would be recognised by those who had a knowledge of the facts. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. B. PICKARD (York, W.R., Normanton) said it was absurd to suppose that workmen would commit an act which would result in injury to themselves in order that they might get compensation. When the Bill was introduced he was so enamoured of its provisions as explained by the Home Secretary, that he advised his people they would make a great mistake if they refused the Measure or did anything to prevent it becoming law. Since then there had been a Second Reading Debate, and there had been attempt after attempt on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite to narrow the scope of the Bill. Evidently the Government dare not face the music. If this Amendment were inserted in the Bill the workmen would at once agree that the Measure would be no good to them. He and those he represented believed that the Bill should not be narrowed in its scope. The underground workers felt it would be most unfortunate if the Amendment of the hon. Member for St. Helens were accepted, and they entirely disclaimed any desire for such legislation. If the Bill was to be narrowed down as was now proposed, he advised his hon. Friends around him to wreck the Bill if possible.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir Matthew White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) said he was rather surprised at the indignation with which the acceptance of this proposal by the Government had been received by certain Gentlemen opposite. Last night the Government signified that they thought it was reasonable they should consider with an open mind whether a workman who had been guilty of wilful and gross negligence should be entitled to compensation. He believed he was correct in stating, notwithstanding what was said by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, that under the German law a workman who had been guilty of negligence could not claim compensation. The Government were determined to make it perfectly clear that if a workman was guilty of gross neglect of rules which he quite understood, or guilty of gross misconduct—they would not now bind themselves to the exact form of words—he should not be entitled to compensation. If a Bill of this kind was to be a fair and just settlement of a vexed question, it must be fair and just not only to the workman but also to the employer—["hear, hear!"]—and he did not believe it was the expectation of any workman that he should receive compensation for any injuries which were directly the result of his own act. He admitted it had been claimed as one of the great merits of the Bill that it would reduce the amount of litigation, and he was not prepared altogether to agree with those hon. Gentlemen who asserted that the acceptance of this Amendment would lead to an increase of the amount of litigation. Was anybody prepared to say that the payment of compensation in respect of a gross breach of well-understood rules ought to be on the same scale as that in respect of an accident where there had been no breach of rules? His right hon. Friend the late Home Secretary had said that the acceptance of this Amendment amounted to a departure from the principle of the Bill. As a matter of fact, they provided in a subsequent clause that if the employer was guilty of special personal negligence, or of gross personal negligence, or of culpable negligence—he did not know what form the words would ultimately take—the man injured should be entitled to special remedy against the employer if he chose to seek it outside the Bill. Why should they not provide that if a workman, well knowing what he had to do, caused through negligence a great accident resulting in loss of life and personal injury, he also should come under some special exemption from the ordinary provisions of this Bill? It seemed to him that what was fair for one party was fair for the other. He failed to see why those hon. Gentlemen representing labour in that House who had spoken on this subject should have charged the Government, by having accepted such a reasonable proposal as this appeared to him to be, with greatly departing from the principle which underlay the Bill. It might be that there were an insignificant number of cases which would come within the scope of this Amendment. He was not for one moment going to say that there were a great number of such cases; but, however that might be, surely, when they were introducing a Bill which cast upon employers a large and heavy burden, in the interests of the community they ought to take care that it did not carry with it the feeling that it was unjust. Could it be held to be just if they did not provide that a workman who was guilty of deliberate neglect of the rules under which he was working was not to be entitled to the same privileges as the man who did his best to conduct himself in obedience to those rules? That was a proposition which ought not, in his opinion, to endanger the success or the popularity of this Bill. He thought it was possible, by words which could be drawn up, to prevent the possibility of introducing the question of contributory negligence and to provide, on the part alike of employer and employed, that they should be outside the provisions of the Bill for all purposes so long as they were guilty of gross, culpable negligence. He understood that that was all that was done in accepting the principle of this Amendment, and he believed it ought to commend itself to the sense of justice both of the Committee and of the country.

Sir FRANK LOCKWOOD (York) ventured to think that the hard cases to which reference had been made were cases which the Government ought to have taken into their consideration before they pledged themselves to the principle of this Bill. [*Cheers.*] But when the Government found themselves brought face to face with the logical consequences of that principle, of which he, for one, most firmly and heartily approved, they somewhat ran away from the Bill—[*Opposition cheers and Ministerial laughter*]—and were willing to water down that great principle for which they no doubt rightly claimed so much. No doubt this Bill was an innovation, but it would not be an innovation long if they were going to accept

Amendments like this. [*Cheers.*] What was the good of the Home Secretary's telling them that, though they accepted this Amendment, they would have nothing to do with contributory negligence? It was merely idle talk. [*Cheers.*] The question of contributory negligence would arise over and over again under the terms of this Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"] It was involved in the Amendment. The Home Secretary had told them that they held the employer responsible for his wrongful and wilful act, and that therefore it was only equitable that they should hold the workman responsible for his wrongful and wilful act. But the Government were doing nothing of the kind. The employer was liable under the law now for his wrongful and wilful act. It was not the Bill of the Government that made him responsible. The Government had said, "Taking the law as we find it, we are going to make this great and generous concession, and we are going to introduce this principle new to our law," and the first thing they did was to begin to whittle it away by the acceptance of an Amendment which made the Bill, to his mind, a nullity and a sham. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. J. M. MACLEAN (Cardiff) said it was a pity this matter had degenerated into a fight between the two sides of the Committee. This Bill had not been introduced for the benefit of the employers. It had been introduced to satisfy the demands of the working classes, which had been recognised over and over again as just by both political parties. If this Bill failed to satisfy the working classes what was the good of having introduced it. He thought there was a great deal to be said for the Amendment. It appealed to one's natural sense of justice. It must seem to every man in that House a most unfair thing that an employer should be forced to pay compensation to any workman who, by gross or deliberate negligence, had wrecked that employer's property and caused the loss of the lives of many of his fellow-workmen. Still, on the other hand, they were confronted with practical difficulties which were expounded by the Colonial Secretary and insisted upon by other hon. Gentlemen, and he confessed that, although his strong feeling at first was in favour of the Amendment, he had been very much impressed with the speeches of the labour Members on the opposite side as to what would be the inevitable effect of introducing an Amendment of that kind. He thought it was perfectly evident that the effect would be to open the door to a considerable evasion of this law, and to minimise to a large extent the beneficial results which would accrue to the working classes. Was it not desirable that the Government should take time to consider this matter? [*Cheers.*] It would really be a great misfortune for the Government, for the House, and for the country if this Bill were deprived of some of its most beneficial features in its progress through Committee. He thought the discussion illustrated the importance of the Debate that took place last night when they urged that the principle of putting the burden on the individual employer alone was a mistaken principle, and that they should lay the whole burden on the community at large. Was it not most unjust that compensation for injuries done in this way should be placed on the individual employer? It forced them to the conclusion that the ultimate result of legislation of this kind must be to place the burden upon the community at large, and make it necessary that all accidents should be compensated in that way by a system of State insurance.

Mr. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouth, N.) said the evil of this Amendment, if it were embodied in the Bill, was that it would open three new defences to an employer in the case of every accident. It was admitted on both sides that the number of accidents which the workman would have contributed to, or would have caused, by his own misconduct, would be very small, but the number of accidents in which one of these three defences would be raised would be enormous. ["Hear, hear!"] Consequently they would have all the evils of litigation imposed, certainly in mining, in upwards of 50 per cent. of the accidents.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It could not possibly be raised in one-half, or anything like one-half of the cases.

Mr. McKENNA saw no reason why it could not be raised in every case. If the defence, or any one of the three defences, could be raised in the first instance it would be raised. The Bill was introduced mainly to avoid litigation. It had only been in Committee two days, and the workman already had to run the gauntlet of five defences which might be set up to his claim. He, therefore, appealed to the Government not to accept an Amendment which would add enormously to the difficulties of the workman.

*MR. ALFRED HOPKINSON (Wilts, Cricklade) thought there had been a tendency on the other side of the House very much to exaggerate the effect of the Amendment, and to minimise what the Bill would be without the Amendment. Under the present law the workman had to prove negligence on the part of the employer or his manager, and the result was that only a small sum had found its way into the workman's pocket. By the Amendment they would bring within the scope of compensation an enormous number of cases in which injury was caused by inevitable accident or the act of another workman. The doctrine of common employment would be entirely abolished as regards employments to which the Act applied. The burden of proof would be cast on the employer, and unless he had a good defence he would not set it up. Many defences could under any Bill be set up. But the employers did not desire to litigate. He believed both sides of the House desired to stop litigation. Under the existing law litigation was necessary, as the employer would not admit negligence, but under this Bill he believed it would be rare. It would shock their sense of natural justice that a man who might have caused the death of a number of fellow workmen should receive compensation because he had met with some slight injury himself. Unless the Amendment was adopted such a man might be properly convicted of manslaughter one day, yet be awarded compensation on the next at the expense of the person whose property he had wilfully injured. Such a position had not been adopted in the German law, and in the draft Bill before the French Chamber the principle of the Amendment was proposed to be adopted too. He did not believe a man would deliberately injure himself, but if a man knew that he would not receive compensation he would be more particular than if he thought he would receive compensation whatever his own act might be. Much was to be said for extending the Act to other trades and employments, but it would be more difficult to extend it without some Amendment of the kind before the Committee.

*SIR C. DILKE said that under the German law nothing but acts of virtual suicide excluded a workman's family from compensation. As to the practical point before the Committee he moved to amend the proposal by leaving out the words

> "wilful disregard by such workman of any rule or regulation contained in or established under any Act of Parliament which it was the duty of such workman to observe."

This would leave for further discussion drunkenness and gross misconduct. These were different questions from those of mining law involved in the earlier part of the Amendment. Those who were not personally acquainted with mines hardly realised the extraordinary network of legislation to which the men would be made amenable if the words were passed in the Government proposal. It was notorious that breaches of the Mines Regulations Acts occurred every day. It was laid down in the general rules—which were equivalent to an Act of Parliament—that a

> "competent person or competent persons appointed by the owner, agent, or manager, for the purpose . . . shall, immediately before the commencement of each shift, inspect every part of the mine situate beyond certain stations."

Then followed a rule by which no workman should pass beyond any such station until the part of the mine beyond that station had been so examined and stated by such competent person to be safe. Every person who passed beyond such station before that inspection had been made would be guilty of an offence under the special rules, and, therefore, in every case where an accident occurred to such workman it would at once be said that he was violating the rules laid down in a portion of the Act of Parliament itself. That would be a matter of daily occurrence. There was a boy killed the other day in his constituency while in charge of a horse drawing tubs. In the course of the inquest it came out that he was being employed in violation of the provision that a person in charge of machinery (tubs drawn by horses coming under this definition) must be a competent male person not less than 18 years of age. In that case, not only would this be a bar to compensation, but even if an accident occurred to a boy over 18, the fact of the accident would be alleged as a reason for believing he was not a competent person, that, therefore, the Act was violated and he could not obtain compensation under the provisions of this Measure. Again one of the rules provided that—

> "Every person shall observe such directions with respect to working as may be given to him."

Any violation of that general rule would be a breach of this Act of Parliament, and every such breach would disqualify for compensation under it in case of an accident. Offences of this general kind would be pleaded in every instance that might arise. There was a case in which a manager gave directions to his engineman, and yet that man was ousted from his compensation, under the present law, because it was held he ought to have disobeyed the mines manager and acted in accordance with the Act of Parliament. He thought the object of the Bill was to get rid of such monstrous decisions as the decision in the case of Heywood *v.* Baker in 1886; but instead of doing so it would continue the injustice unless some Amendments were accepted in the direction he had suggested. He begged to move the Amendment.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN observed that the point of view of the Government was that the change they suggested was a minor one which would not be attended with a fraction of the consequences which had been alleged by hon. Members, and especially by some representatives of the mining interests. He rose for the purpose of appealing to hon. Gentlemen opposite who took this view to help the Government by suggesting a form of words which, while saving this feeling of natural justice, which the Government desired to save, would prevent the consequences which they feared. There seemed to be no difference as to the principle upon the two sides of the House. No single Member had got up to deny that the case which had been put, of a man who had brought about an accident, by his own deliberate misconduct, to himself and fellows, was not a case for compensation. Everybody had admitted that as a matter of justice. ["Hear, hear!"] It would be a defect in the Bill if that case, however exceptional it might be, were not met. Some hon. Members said that the words in which the Government proposed to meet it were much too wide. If hon. Members on the other side would suggest a practical Amendment to cover the case, and which would exclude the cases it was not desired to include, the Government would give it their favourable consideration. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not think that object was secured by such an Amendment as that which had been proposed by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) desired to call attention to the position the Committee were in. An Amendment had been proposed by the hon. Member for St. Helens, to which an Amendment had been proposed by the Government, while a further Amendment had been proposed by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean to that of the Government. The Government Amendment was not on the Paper; hon. Members had not had an opportunity of studying it or considering whether its language was appropriate for dealing with such a difficult and delicate question. The hon. Member for Cardiff had made the practical suggestion that this matter might be withdrawn for the present. In his opinion it would come more appropriately in the form of a new clause. It was not at all necessary it should come in this part of the Bill, and if the matter was postponed there would be time for conference between Members and for considering what was the most appropriate language to employ. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL thought that this was the appropriate place for inserting the Amendment, and that its insertion would not preclude any further suggestion. It was not the intention of the Government by their Amendment to cover mere technical breaches of regulations, nor did he think for one moment it would have the effect of setting up again the principle of contributory negligence. He promised between this and subsequent stages of the Bill to consider whether any guarded words were necessary to prevent contributory negligence from being set up. What the Government desired was to exclude from compensation the workman who had caused the accident by his wrongful act alone. If the suggestion was acceded to that the question should be postponed, he hoped they should not have the whole matter debated again. [" Hear, hear! "]

MR. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) joined in the appeal that the Amendment on this particular head should be postponed. The matter was one which required most careful consideration, and the Government would be well advised, in the interests of time and the progress of the Bill, to consent to the postponement.

MR. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) said that employers often stood by and allowed men to break rules, but if an accident resulted from such a breach of rule with the employer's connivance, the man would have no compensation if this Amendment were carried. They ought to try to get some protection for the workers as well as some compensation, and if the Government would adjourn this question he would suggest an addition to the section—

> "That no employer shall be entitled to the benefit of this section if it can be proved that the accident has arisen fom the breach of a rule which had been allowed by such employer to be systematically disobeyed."

[*Laughter.*] He did not know why hon. Members were so greatly amused. Surely it was a most objectionable thing that an employer should be allowed to stand by and see workmen break a rule day after day, and then, when the workman was injured in consequence, he should be able to plead the breach of rule as a bar against compensation. He would deprive the employer of the right to plead such a defence, and was certain that it would tend to prevent many accidents.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said the discussion had opened up a very wide field, and it had not convinced the Government that they were wrong in accepting the principle of the Amendment suggested. At the same time, they felt there were considerable difficulties in fixing the particular form of it. They were perfectly willing that the Amendment should be withdrawn on the understanding that he would consider how to give effect to it at a later stage of the Bill. He hoped his hon. Friend would be inclined to accept that assurance, and withdraw. [" Hear, hear! "]

Attorney General.

*SIR C. DILKE said the Amendment before the Committee at that moment was his own, and he had great pleasure in acceding to the suggestion of the Home Secretary.

Question proposed, "That the words down to 'observe,' inclusive, stand part of the Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended."

Amendment proposed to the Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment, as amended, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) rose to move, in Sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words:—

> "A claim is lodged with the employer or his representative within three months after the accident causing the injury."

In moving this Amendment, he disclaimed any hostility to the Bill. On the Second Reading he expressed his approval of its general principle, but he had also said that this was a Bill which required very careful consideration, and that the Government would do well to take the advice of practical men. His Amendment was not intended to attack the principle of the Bill, but to make it a practical working Bill. He had had a great deal of experience, having sat in judgment on quite one-half of the whole of the cases of claims against employers in Scotland, and that experience led him to tell the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill that he would do well to consider carefully the importance of the point involved in his Amendment. There was no limit in the Bill to the time during which an injured person might bring a claim for compensation. This was a most important omission. He had named three months, because the right hon. Member for East Fife adopted that as the proper time for lodging claims in his Employers' Liability Bill, but he should be satisfied with anything reasonable. It was no mere fancy on his part when he said that unless a limit was stated, claims might be brought five, ten, or even twenty years after an accident. He had in his hand details of a case in which a lad in the employ of a coal company was injured, and after having been kept in easy employment for seven years, he was advised to bring an action for £500. The coal company won the action in two Courts, but it cost them £300, so that victory was almost as bad as defeat. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would give his suggestion careful consideration.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) hoped the Government had advisedly made a distinction between their Bill and the Act of 1880, and that the provision as to notice would not be inserted; for he was quite sure that it had caused an immense amount of injustice, and had given rise to the strongest feeling on both sides in reference to the Employers' Liability Act of 1880. No doubt notice of injury or of action was a convenience in itself, and it carried some advantages with it—such as identification and the possibility of arrangement with the individual making the claim. But what he had to ask was, why should the case of the workman be made a distinction from almost all other cases arising under the law? Take the case of a collision in the street, giving rise to an action for negligence. It would be obviously desirable that immediate notice should be given, but there was no such obligation here. He would point out that in such a case, the occurrence being transitory, immediate notice was much more necessary than in the case of a workman who was more or less well-known to his employer, or his manager, and yet the Act of 1880 imposed the liability to notice on the workman, while the general law imposed nothing of the sort. He was not going to impeach employers generally, far from it, but there were exceptions, and anyone who was familiar with the cases knew that very often the employer showed great consideration and benevolence during the statutory period, but immediately that term had expired, the injured workman was put at arm's length, and the benevolence ceased. The effect of this provision, therefore, as in the Act of 1880, would be to deprive the workman of compensation simply because notice had not been given, and to place him in an invidious and unjust position. A strong argument had been based on the desire to prevent litigation. But the great defect of the Act of 1880 was that a large proportion of the litigation under it had arisen in connection with the failure to give notices. It was singular, by the way, that in that Act, in the most important of all cases, viz., that of death, there was an express proviso that notice need not be given. He strongly urged the desirability of leaving all these cases on the footing of the general law. Employers might well, as a matter of economy, make even great sacrifices for the sake of establishing and preserving good relations with their workmen. But if, on the one hand, they apparently made sacrifices, and then defeated the just expectations of the men by a technical and an artificial rule as to notice, that would give rise to the same feeling that followed on the Act of 1880 and defeat the object of the Bill.

*MR. CHARLES HARRISON (Plymouth) hoped the Government would not adopt the proposal to require notice. They all knew that there was a regular system carried on under the existing Employers' Liability Act, which required notice of claim to be given. There were persons who made it their business to watch for accidents, and then to run off after the workman or other persons suffering, and inform them that they could not bring their claim without legal advice. The sure and certain result of the statutory requirement of notice of claim was to bring about litigation, with its attendant expense. Speaking from considerable experience as one connected with a very large accident insurance office, he knew that nothing gave rise to more litigation than the imposition by the Act of the necessity of giving notice of claim to the office or to the employer. In addition to that, there had been numerous instances in which notice had been given, and the Courts had been asked over and over again to construe whether the notice had been sufficient within the meaning of the Act. They had had cases in which letters had been written by professional men on the part of injured workmen, claiming compensation, and referring to reports on the accidents made by the Government Inspector, and it had been held by the Courts that the notice had not been sufficient because the report referred to had not been incorporated in the actual notice of claim. The provision requiring notice of claim gave rise to all sorts of technicalities, and encouraged litigation, and he hoped the Government would not adopt it. ["Hear, hear!"]

COLONEL DENNY said he had been connected with an accident fund for fifteen or twenty years. One of the rules was that notification should be given within a certain period, and that had never been found to work hardly. He thought in all the friendly societies notice was required, and he did not think it could be any hardship. Both the last speakers had referred to hardship under an Act that was now practically done away with. Under that Act the whole onus of proof lay upon the man, but in this case the whole onus lay upon the master.

*MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) thought if the Government intended to accept any such Amendment, it was desirable that the claim should be made in writing. With regard to the period of notice of the accident it seemed to him that three months was too long. It would be easy for a workman to advise his employer of an accident within a comparatively few hours of the occurrence, and he thought three days' notice would be better than three months. There were however, accidents, such as those to the spine and the brain, which took days and even weeks to develop, and he would add words to the Amendment to meet such cases. The Amendment, in his view, should read

> "A claim in writing is lodged with the employer or his representative if a notice of the accident has been previously given within three days of the accident or of the development of the injury."

SIR J. JOICEY hoped the hon. Member would not press the Amendment. All that was really required was that a notification of the accident should be given within at least three days. Every colliery owner was bound to give notice to the mining inspector within 24 hours of any accident that occurred. In his opinion it would be unreasonable and unjust to deprive a workman of his advantages under the common law, and he thought if notice of the accident was given it would be sufficient to meet the necessities of the case.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said it might be difficult in the case of a serious accident to formulate a claim within a limited period. What was wanted for the practical working of the Measure was an almost immediate notification of the injury. He spoke from some practical experience of the working of one of these schemes, and the difficulty was in many cases to decide whether a man really got the injury at his work or at another time and in another occupation. He did not think it would be any hardship to require prompt notification of an accident.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. The question of notice of claim was rather a difficult one, and he thought the matter should be left to the operation of the ordinary law.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he had never been able to see why under the present Employers' Liability Bill notice of claim should be given within a certain period, as the employer would have ample protection if notice of the accident was given as soon as possible. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chester-le-Street had already pointed out that under the Mines Regulation Act notice of an accident must be given within 24 hours to the Home Office, and with regard to the Miners' Provident Society it was provided that in order that the doctor might attend at once, and that the injured man might be well cared for, notice should be given within three days, and he could not obtain money from the funds if it was not given within 35 days.

MR. J. L. WALTON (Leeds, S.) thought the Amendment represented a legitimate effort to introduce a period of limitation into the Bill. It was an extraordinary feature of this legislation that these claims might be brought at any period during the lives of any number of generations of human beings who might as dependants be entitled to claim compensation under the Bill. The Home Secretary seemed to be under some misconception as to the operation of the ordinary law.

He knew of no statute which would introduce a period of limitation into the operation of this Bill. He thought some principle of limitation should be introduced. He could not conceive a case of greater hardship than a claim being brought years after an accident, when all the evidence necessary for its investigation had been destroyed, leaving the employer entirely at the mercy of some unscrupulous person who might promote claims of that kind.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said there was a distinction between notice of claim and notice of accident. He hoped his hon. Friend would withdraw his Amendment, to which the Government could not assent, in order that they might discuss the question of notice of accident.

Mr. ASQUITH asked, in view of the very pertinent observations of the hon. Member for Leeds, whether the Government intended to introduce any period of limitation? As the Bill stood, there was no period of limitation, and the Statute of Limitations would not apply. He was not in favour of such a limitation as that suggested in the Amendment, which was almost grotesque in its brevity, but, sooner or later, the Government would have to provide some limit of time, and he hoped they would follow the analogy existing in regard to common law actions.

Mr. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) desired to point out that within a period of three months the whole of the evidence of an accident might be entirely destroyed.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY hoped his hon. Friend would withdraw his Amendment. He was quite willing to say that the Government would consider the question as to how far the common law limitation would apply.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. HARRISON moved to insert the following words:—

> "Notice of any accident to a workman shall be given by or on behalf of the workman to the employer or his agent as soon as possible, and in no case later than three months after the happening thereof."

The hon. Member pointed out that whilst he had objected to the proposal for giving notice of claim, this Amendment related only to the notice of the accident; and it was essential, in order to afford the employer the opportunity of inquiry, that notice of an accident should be given as soon as practicable. Since the Act of 1880 there had grown up a vast field of insurance on policies between workmen direct and insurance offices and provident funds, and in all those cases there was not a single policy which did not contain a provision that the accident was to be generally specified within three or four days of the cause of accident. That was too short a time for a statute which might deprive the workman of his compensation, and, therefore, this notice had studiously enlarged the time to a period of three months, which would cover all reasonable time, and three months had been fixed upon with reference to giving certain elasticity, and prevent anything like forfeiture of the right to compensation owing to the notice not having been given. Further, the Amendment was so worded as to allow a notice, whether verbal or in writing, to be given by or on behalf of the workman, and its object was to avoid imposing on the workman as a condition precedent to his right to compensation any formalities which would involve either the calling in of professional persons to formulate the notice, or to require that the notice should be given by the workman personally, instead of by some mate or friend or member of his family—a provision which might be very necessary in case of serious accident incapacitating the workman from himself giving notice.

Mr. R. B. HALDANE (Haddington) sympathised with the object of his hon. Friend, but believed that the Amendment would do more mischief than good. Why should a workman be placed in a worse position than any one else? If they adopted this Amendment they would place him in a worse position than any other member of the community.

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said if an accident occurred in a factory the employer had to give notice of it within 24 hours, and he saw no reason why an employer should not receive notice of an accident within a reasonable time. He moved to amend the Amendment by substituting 24 hours for three months.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) did not see why they should be hampered by these restrictions, which were unknown to the ordinary law. At present an employer was liable to have an action brought against him, and he hoped the Government on this matter would follow the ordinary course of practice. The hon. Member suggested 24 hours notice. Why, a man might be insensible for 24 hours after the accident.

MR. C. B. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) thought that the employers of labour were entitled to some protection under the Bill. There ought to be some limit for these claims. ["Hear, hear!"] There ought certainly to be some limit as to the time when the claim should be made.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said it would be an unfortunate thing for the Bill if it made it a condition precedent to obtaining compensation that such notification of accident should be given. He was of opinion that it was one of the subjects which should be considered by the arbitrator.

SIR J. JOICEY said he was rather surprised at the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. They were not asking anything unreasonable in asking that within a reasonable time notice of an accident should be given. The workmen's own relief societies required that notification of accidents should be made within three days. It had been suggested that employers should insure against the risks under the Bill. He was certain that unless there was notification of accidents, say in two or three days, they would not get any insurance company to take the risks.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) could quite understand attorneys and learned counsel objecting to any notice being given, because the direct result of no notice being required would be to leave employers for ever open to litigation. Twenty-four hours' notice was too short, but a fair notice should be given, otherwise not only would the employer be liable for ever, but his descendants, his executors, administrators, and assigns. [*Laughter.*] Again, the Act could only be made workable by its giving rise to a system of insurance; and there must be a definiteness about the object of insurance; and there must be large areas or the averages would not work. He suggested that his hon. Friend should withdraw his Amendment if the Home Secretary would undertake to insert words which would provide that one of the matters to be considered by the arbitrator should be whether due notice of the accident had been given.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT contended that the presence or absence of notice of an accident within a reasonable time of the occurrence would be taken into consideration by any Court, tribunal, or arbitrator. The absence of notice for a year, for instance, would very probably lead an arbitrator to say that the employer was not liable at all. On the other hand, solicitors knew very well how a statutory term for notice was sometimes worked at present to the prejudice of the employé. The negotiations proceeded for a time, the statutory term ended, the charitable feeling ceased to prevail, the matter went into the hands of solicitors, the company or employer took up a legal position, and very often the employé got nothing at all.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said that they were now adopting legislation which would place upon employers a responsibility which they had never yet had, and a very grave responsibility it would be to some of them. They were accepting it as cheerfully as they could. They wished to make the best of it. But surely the Committee would provide that employers should receive reasonable notice of accidents for one reason, if for no other, namely, that the employer might see that the injured received medical care after he had obtained what was called first aid from his comrades, who almost all belonged to the ambulance corps. He could not believe that the Committee would place an employer in a worse position than men had placed themselves in with regard to provident societies. There were 122,000 men in the Northumberland and Durham Miners' Provident Society, and it was a condition precedent to a penny being paid in case of injury that notice of the accident should be given within three days.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he would like to ask hon. Members a question respecting the mutual provident funds which were so largely contributed to in the North. The hon. Baronet had said that three days' notice was required. If from some cause, which did not involve any fault on the part of the workman, the workman failed to give three days' notice, did that, as by a law of the Medes and Persians, exclude him from all compensation?

*Mr. J. WILSON (Durham) remarked that, as he had been a member of the committee of the Northumberland and Durham Miners Permanent Relief Fund, he was able to reply to the right hon. Gentleman. If a man did not give notice in time he was only paid from the time he gave notice. But a man was allowed to work 35 days after an accident, and if injury developed itself in that time he would not be debarred from benefit.

Mr. S. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow) stated that the Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Society had a rule under which a man did not receive benefit unless he gave notice within three days. He knew of a case where a man was permanently prohibited from getting compensation because he did not give notice within the required time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said it was, therefore, perfectly evident that the Northumberland and Durham Society was much more generous, and, he thought, much more just than that to which the hon. Member for Walthamstow belonged. Confining himself to the Northern society, let him say that the case of that society and its members was very different to that of employer and workman. A mutual society was able by means of the discretion of the Committee to take into account any failing on the part of the workman to give notice, and if the Committee was persuaded that that failure did not constitute an attempt to impose on the society, it was evident the workman would not suffer. If, however, they were to put into the Bill a definite provision that failure to give notice should in all cases exclude the workman from all compensation, he was certain they would do injustice in a vast number of cases unless the employer in all cases proved as liberal as a mutual society. He thought they might very safely leave it to the discretion of the arbitrator to decide whether or not the failure of notice might be cited as part of the evidence against the claim. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. ASQUITH said he entirely agreed with everything that had fallen from his right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary on this subject, and he hoped the Government would adhere to the position they had taken up in regard to it. He was certain that the Amendment, if carried, would be productive of an enormous amount of injustice, and injustice to the man in many cases where it was not in the least degree needed for the protection of the employer. The Amendment did not even except the cases where an employer had knowledge independent of any notice. In almost every well-regulated undertaking in this country the employer knew perfectly well of these accidents, without receiving notice from the men, and under the Coal Mines Act and the Factory Act, it was his duty, within a prescribed period, and subject to a penalty, to give notice to the Government inspector that an accident had occurred. On the other hand, while this was not needed as a protection for the employer, if it was made a condition precedent to a man's right to recover, an informality in the notice might be sufficient to altogether disendow him of compensation.

Mr. CHARLES SEELY (Lincoln) would like to press the consideration of this question upon the Government. The hon. Members who had spoken against it had regarded it principally from the point of view of serious accidents. As a matter of fact it was not the serious accidents in which this question would arise. It was in the case of slight accidents that it would arise, and he wondered whether the Government would consider the question of inserting some such words as,—

> "That, in all cases where notice is not to be given by the employer to the factory or mine inspector, it shall be a condition that the workman should give notice to the employer of an accident having happened."

In all serious cases the employer must naturally be aware of what happened, but there was undoubtedly the risk that in slight cases claims might be made on an employer, which were not in themselves reasonable for accidents which had happened. It was now the universal custom in all friendly and miners' accident societies that notice should be given of an accident, and it was necessary for the protection of the employer and of the workmen themselves that an arrangement of this kind should be provided. It was admitted that some portion of this burden would have to be borne by the workmen out of their wages, and it was, therefore, only right and reasonable to the workmen that they should put in provisions which would avoid risk of the honest, respectable, and hard-working man having to pay his share of an unreasonable and improper claim.

Mr. J. W. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) hoped the Government would stick to the very sensible position they had taken up. Speaking as an employer of labour, he thought a great deal too much stress had been put on this giving of notice of an accident. He thoroughly appreciated the necessity of giving notice of a claim for compensation, but that had already been dealt with. Something had been said of the analogy of a friendly society, but it must be remembered that it was absolutely necessary to give notice to a friendly society, because they had no other means of knowing that an accident had occurred. As to the case of slight accidents, all he could say was that if an accident was so slight that an employer, taking the precautions for getting notice that he ought to do, did not know of it, then he thought the arbitrator would consider it was a case for very slight compensation, or for no compensation at all.

Mr. W. J. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) hoped the Government would reconsider the position they had taken up in this matter. He would give a case which had come under his notice only that morning. A workman employed on a rivet machine injured his wrist. He worked two days after the injury and then went away and had been off work five weeks. How could an employer possibly know that man was injured unless he had notice given to him. He would like to know whether practically the same provision which was in the present Act could not be put into this Bill. He quite agreed that 24 hours, or even three days, was short notice, but he thought that six weeks or some such period as that was reasonable, and that, at all events, an employer should not be liable for ever for an accident of which he had no notice and of which, when he came to defend it, he might have no means of knowing whether it did or did not take place.

Mr. EMERSON BAINBRIDGE (Lincoln, Gainsborough) made a further appeal to the Government on this question. This was a Bill under which very big claims would be made, and he was sure the House would think it was only fair and just that there should be some kind of notice given with regard to accidents. He could see no injustice whatever to the workmen in this. He would suggest either three or six days, but, whatever period was thought best, it was, in his opinion, only common justice that those who might have to pay large claims should have some just and reasonable notice.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanark, Partick) hoped the Government would be able to meet, in some way, the views of those who felt very strongly that some form of notice was necessary as a protection against bogus claims and litigation. He should like to know whether the Government could not provide that the man should have power to show, before the arbitrator, that there was some special reason why he had not given notice within the time appointed, and that in those cases want of notice should not be held to deprive him of his claim against the employer. They were giving him, under this Bill, far better terms than any person who came under the common law, and it became a matter of special urgency to the employer that he should have the opportunity of collecting evidence at an early date before it had got scattered. There was also the proposal mentioned by the hon. Member for Durham, in response to the question of the Colonial Secretary, which the Government might see their way clear to accept. Would it not be a fair solution to say that the claim should be made as soon as possible, and that the workman should not be entitled to any allowance for the period before the claim was made? Surely that would not be more than a fair penalty for his laxity. That would be, as it seemed to him, sufficiently strong pressure on the workman to make him make his claim, without being open to the objection that could be rightly taken against any arbitrary limit.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough) said the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken seemed to imagine that workmen were millionaires. It was very evident that unless a workman had a large sum in the Savings Bank, he would have to go somewhere for relief. His wife would soon discover his position under the Act—[*laughter*]—and would apply to the employers without delay.

Mr. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) said he had a clause of which he would be glad to make a present to the Government. It was to the effect that proceedings for recovery under the Act should not be maintained unless notice had been given within six weeks, and an arbitration commenced within six months from the time of the accident; or in case of death within 12 months of the time of the death; provided that in case of death want of notice should be no bar to proceedings. He thought that would meet the arguments on both sides.

Mr. T. R. LEUTY (Leeds, E.) appealed to the Government not to make any concession whatever. The argument as to friendly societies was quite beside the mark. In their case notification was necessary because their members were scattered over a large area. Now the employer was to be the means of providing the workman with insurance. He hoped that the Government would make no extension except to provide against bogus claims by men for accidents met with when not at work. If the Government made some form of notification necessary they would be putting an absolutely unnecessary barrier between the workman and his compensation. All the arguments based on the necessity for prompt notification in the past were worthless. In the past a claim could only be made if the employer was in fault, but employers would now have to assume that if an accident happened and the man injured was absent from his work for two weeks, they would have to pay. In view of that knowledge on the part of the employer he did hope that for the sake of possibly eliminating one case of fraud, the Government would not endanger the men's compensation in the other 99 cases.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said the hon. Gentleman opposite might rest assured that the Government would not make any concession that would detract from the value of the Bill. His right hon. Friend had promised on behalf of the Government to consider whether any notification of a claim should be made, and undoubtedly in connection with that, the Government would have to see whether it could not be provided that, in the event of notice not having been given, the claim for compensation should not be commenced until the notice had been given. Those were points which the Government were pledged to consider. Beyond that he did not go; but he would ask whether the friends of the Bill would assist the Government to make a little more rapid progress. ["Hear, hear!"] This was only one of some hundreds of questions of more or less importance which could be raised as possible additions to the Bill; and if they were to spend so much time on each, they would never make satisfactory progress. ["Hear, hear!"] He would suggest that now either his hon. Friend should withdraw his Amendment or, if he could not agree to that, they might take a division.

Colonel DENNY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment, remarking that he had already risen three or four times for the purpose.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. J. WILSON (Durham) moved to leave out paragraph (*a*) Sub-section (2). He suggested the omission of the paragraph because he thought it would very largely destroy the effect of the Bill, so far as the workmen were concerned. The Bill set forth that compensation was to be provided for all accidents, but if this paragraph were maintained some accidents would be omitted from the scope of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies had said that the Government were dealing in the Bill with the whole of the accidents occurring in the included trades, but those were excepted which only disabled a man for two weeks or less. Bearing on that, he wished to give a few figures relating to the Miners' Relief Fund in the north of England, which supplied expressive data. He had in his hands the balance sheet of that society, which covered Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland, and the ironstone mines of Cleveland, and included in its membership the whole of the men at work down the mines and a very large number of those working at bank, the total number of members being nearly 123,000. During the year 1896-97 there were 19,200 cases of minor accidents—namely, those cases that did not last longer than six months. He might say that the relief paid in minor accidents was 5s. a week. If the cases lasted over six months, they were classified as permanent, and the disabled men then got 8s. a week. Out of the 19,200 minor accidents, no less than 5,000 lasted less than two weeks. So that by the operation of this Bill one-fourth of the minor accidents in the north of England would be excluded and would receive no benefit whatever. He wanted the Secretary for the Colonies or the Home Secretary to tell them their reasons for excluding the workman from benefit for the first week if he was to be entitled to it in the third? Of course, the Colonial Secretary had told them that logic had no place whatever in the Bill. Still, they were compelled to ask the why and wherefore, and unless some solid reason was given why the workman should not have relief the first week if he was to have it the third and fourth, he was right in his demand that the sub-section should be excluded altogether. Friendly societies, he might remind them, gave their benefits the first week a man was off. He had listened very closely to the arguments of the promoters of the Bill in order to gather one or two reasons why this exclusion should take place, but he had failed to find one. He had not been enamoured of the Bill, because he had seen in it what he thought would be evils so far as the workmen were concerned. He would not go into them now, but this was one of them. One of the imaginary reasons for the sub-section was that there must be time for the effects of an accident to develop. But if a man was off work the second day, surely the effects had developed enough to entitle him to some benefit. Employers of labour in that House, of all classes of politics, had heartily welcomed the Bill and readily admitted the workman's right to compensation. He assumed that every hon. Member who supported the Bill was genuine in his wish to carry that out to its ultimate result. Then why were they to debar a workman from compensation during the first week of his accident? Was it suggested that he had some resources of his own, that he had money in the savings bank sufficient to carry him over the first two or three weeks? The wages-list of this country was a denial of the possibility of every man making any such provisions. In the large majority of cases wages were so low, that from the first day a man was injured he was within touch of poverty. No doubt there were some workmen who were paid well enough to enable them to lay up a small store to last a week or two.; but there were hundreds and thousands who could not do it. He concluded by again appealing to the Home Secretary or the Secretary for the Colonies to give the Committee some reasons for the exclusion contained in the sub-section.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said he would endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman by giving the explanation he asked for. At the outset he might say that the Amendment was one which by no possibility could the Government accept. It was an Amendment which, if carried, would be the death of the Bill. It was hostile to the Bill, and he pressed that on the attention of all friends of the Bill. As he understood the position of the friends of the Bill was this: The Bill might well be extended, but rather than risk it they would take it as it was, believing it to be a very substantial concession. ["Hear, hear!"] He was obliged to say, therefore, that this was a serious Amendment to which the Government must give strenuous opposition. The reason why the limit of two weeks was introduced was this. The Bill applied a new principle to industry, and threw a new burden on employers and on the trades they represented independent altogether of any negligence or action attributed to the employers themselves. This new principle the Government would only be justified in applying by some great public human interest. Now that great public human interest arose in the case of what he might call serious accidents. The sufferers from those accidents were the wounded soldiers of industry whom they had in their minds, and about whom so much was said in discussing this subject—people who were seriously if not permanently injured, and prevented, at all events for a considerable period, from following their ordinary employment. There would be no ground for legislative interference if they could believe that every accident which occurred was an accident whose effects would not last longer than three weeks. Such accidents as those were accidents for which the workman might very properly be expected to make provision himself. He did make provision in his friendly societies and in his trade union. Bodies of that kind had been accustomed to provide for him in the case of these shorter periods of disablement; and he might say in passing that he thought it would be a very great blow to the friendly societies, and perhaps to the trade unions, if they were to undertake to provide for the workman from the very day on which the accident occurred. ["Hear, hear!"] They therefore drew the line between what they called slight accidents, which might be properly cared for by friendly and other industrial societies, and the more serious accidents which constituted a grave misfortune and for which they were anxious that legislation should provide. In doing so they followed the principle of German and other foreign legislation, actual and proposed. In the first instance the Government suggested or proposed to themselves to exclude the first four weeks of an accident; but in that case they intended that, if the illness lasted more than four weeks, the four weeks' back pay should be given. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Opposition.*] But it was represented to them, both by employers and by some representatives of workmen's societies, that a proposal of that kind was very dangerous. It was admitted, he believed, by all who had an active part in the management of mutual relief and friendly societies that malingering was a thing to be carefully guarded against; and it was represented to the Government that such an arrangement as he had described would tend to provoke malingering and put a premium upon it; that in fact would put a distinct temptation in the way of a workman who had received a slight injury to remain away from his employment four weeks and one day in order that he might obtain four weeks' compensation. It was represented that if they gave a shorter time, and made that a period for which there would be no payment whatever, there would be a complete answer to those who feared malingering would result; because it was extremely improbable that any man would lie in bed a fortnight without real reason in the hope of getting a day or two's pay at the end of that time. ["Hear, hear"!] He hoped, therefore, that after the explanation he had given the Committee would support the Government in resisting the Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"]

On the return of the Chairman of Ways and Means, after the usual interval,

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON regretted that the Colonial Secretary had viewed this Amendment as a hostile one. There was a good deal to be said in its favour. It was a great hardship on a workman who had been out of employment for ten or twelve weeks and had just secured employment, but through an accident for which he was not responsible was laid up for ten or twelve days, not to receive compensation. If he understood the Bill, however, the workman had a right to sue for compensation either under this Bill or under the Act of 1880. If this clause stood as part of the Bill, therefore, a workman who had been injured would be forced to seek compensation under the earlier Act, thereby encouraging litigation.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. L. HARDY (Kent, Ashford) moved, in paragraph (*a*) sub-section (2) to leave out the word "two," and insert the word "four," the effect of the Amendment being to relieve the employer of liability in respect of any injury "which does not disable the workman for a period of at least four weeks from earning full wages." He pointed out that in the large societies connected with the Miners' Relief Fund, it had been found that the average duration of minor accidents was about four weeks; and it was on this ground, he thought, that it would be desirable to put the limit rather higher than in the Bill. A four weeks limit would be the safest to adopt. It had been adopted to a certain extent in Germany, and he therefore urged the Government to accept the Amendment.

Mr. FENWICK hoped it was unnecessary to appeal to the Government to reject the Amendment. If the hon. Member wished to protect the friendly societies and particularly the Miners' Permanent Relief Societies, he would do so best by reducing the time instead of increasing it. Compensation from the employers would then come in, and permanent relief funds could accordingly reduce their benefits.

MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens) said he supported the Amendment, which raised a most important question—the distribution of the burden of compensation under the Bill as between employer and friendly society. The employer was at present only liable to the extent of his contribution—generally 25 per cent.—to the friendly society, and the compensation imposed on the employer fell either on the workman or the community. By the Bill the whole liability for compensation for personal injuries to the workman would be thrown on the employers. The extension of time would relieve the employer and encourage thrift in working men, because they would have to rely longer on their friendly societies. He considered that the chief blot in this Bill was that it imposed too great a burden on some of the great industries of this country. [" Hear, hear ! "] He was in favour of the principle of compensation, but not of so allocating or distributing it as to drive some industries out of existence. [" Hear, hear ! "] Had hon. Members opposite never thought of foreign competition or the cost of production? They might be taking away with one hand what they were conferring with the other, and driving some of the men they professed to represent out of employment into the streets. On this ground he desired that the burden of compensation should be distributed. This distribution rested entirely on figures, to which he wished to seriously call the attention of the Government, calculations made by one whom they would admit was a fairly high authority —Mr. Neison, Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries—who had gone carefully into the financial aspects of the Bill. He was not the authority consulted by the Government. His figures contradicted the figures supplied to the Government; and, while he did not claim that Mr. Neison's figures were infallible, it showed that the point was open to argument. The supporters of the Amendment desired to extend the period of two weeks to four weeks, during which a man would have to rely on his own resources. Mr. Neison, basing his calculations on the accounts of the Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Permanent Relief Fund, stated that for every 10,000 men employed in the coal-mining industry a moderate estimate of the liability for fatal accidents would be £5,000 a year. The average wages for 10,000 colliers above and below ground would be £600,000 a year, or £60 a year per miner, which, if anything, would be under rather than over the mark. Five thousand pounds a year for fatal accidents would be nearly 1 per cent of the the total wages. It had been said that the total liability would not exceed 1 per cent. of the wages earned, but here it was shown that the liability for fatal accidents alone would be 1 per cent. Mr. Neison divided accidents which would not be fatal into two classes —accidents above six months and under six mouths. The liability for accidents over six months in respect of 10,000 men, taking the ordinary figures of the society he had referred to, would amount again to £5,000 a year, or nearly another one per cent. of the wages fund. Five thousand pounds *plus* £5,000 would be the liability imposed yearly on the mining industry in respect of accidents, fatal and non-fatal, to 10,000 men. Ten thousand pounds on £600,000 was one-and-a-half per cent. of the wages. The liability for accidents under six months in respect of 10,000 men would be £4,500. The net result of the calculation was that, taking 10,000 miners earning an average of £60 per year per miner, the total liability for accidents, fatal and non-fatal, would be £14,500 a year, or two-and-a-half per cent. on the wages earned. He trusted the House would consider these calculations before passing the Bill. What was he asking the House to do? It was a ridiculously small concession. The two weeks reduced the number of accidents for which employers were liable under the Bill 20 per cent., but it only reduced the costs of compensation to which they were liable 5 per cent. If they extended the period to four weeks it reduced the number of accidents for which employers were liable 50 per cent., and it reduced the costs of compensation 33 per cent. The 50 per cent. and the 33 per cent. did not apply to anything like the whole liability under the Bill.

The net result was this: by the Amendment, he was asking the House to relieve the employers of a liability of a third out of a total liability of £4,500; in other words it would relieve them of a money compensation of £1,500. It would still leave a burden of no less than 2¼ per cent. on the wages fund of the industry. In other words, every colliery proprietor would find that if he paid, say, £100,000 a year in wages, he would pay no less than £2,500 under the scheme of compensation imposed by this Bill. There were many collieries now being worked under serious difficulties, and it was a question from year to year whether the owners would think it worth their while to go on. He knew one which was being worked at a dead loss of several thousand pounds a year, and the only reason why they were going on was that the proprietors owned other large works to which the colliery in question supplied fuel, so that they could afford to work the colliery at a loss. But in the case of other collieries similarly situated they might be imposing a burden on that industry which would finally compel them to close their works. What was the meaning of that? It meant that this legislation might have the effect of driving hundreds of people out of work, and that was the only consideration that actuated him in moving Amendments to this Bill. With regard to the friendly societies, he asked hon. Members to put themselves in the position of a collier who was subscribing a certain proportion of his wages to a permanent relief society to which his employer also subscribed. The collier would say, "Here is a Bill under which, no matter what kind of accident I suffer from, I shall be compensated on a handsome scale. Why should I subscribe a halfpenny of my wages to the funds of a society, when I can get everything I want out of the Bill for nothing?" The argument was perfectly sound and logical. For his part he should not hesitate for a moment. If they were going to relieve the workman without any effort on his part they would encourage habits of indolence and thriftlessness. The workman must be interested, and the sole object of the Amendment was to ameliorate this state of things and to bring about a slightly more equitable distribution of the burden of compensation which was imposed by this Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said it was not possible for the Government to accept the Amendment. They were satisfied that if such a period as four weeks were to be chosen it would be absolutely necessary, in the event of the disablement extending over the four weeks, to make the payment relate back. The Government had selected the period which they thought would fairly cover minor accidents which, though they might temporarily disable, were not sufficiently serious to prevent work from being resumed within a week or ten days. On the question of figures he must say that those which the hon. Member had given as being furnished by Mr. Neison did not correspond with the figures which that gentleman supplied to her Majesty's Government. It might be that further investigation had caused Mr. Neison to alter his figures, but the Committee could not place very much reliance upon the last figures of Mr. Neison when they found that there was such a substantial variation between them and those supplied to the Home Secretary so recently as May 18. He was not attacking Mr. Neison, but it was not possible to place the same reliance on the figures of any gentleman when they changed within so comparatively short a time. The hon. Member estimated the total liability under the Bill at 2½ per cent. upon the wages paid. That represented a serious charge. The Government did not agree that the total burden would be so large, but, assuming it was so, it was no good upon this Amendment discussing what was to be the total burden with reference to death liability and permanent disablement liability when the material figures to be considered were the difference between four weeks and two weeks. ["Hear, hear!"] It seemed to him that apart from money calculations, which it must be difficult to make with accuracy, there were certain broad principles upon which they should proceed. They knew what a serious accident meant, and what, comparatively speaking, a less serious accident meant. If a man was laid aside for a fortnight, he did to a certain extent draw a line of demarcation between what might be called a serious accident and a non-serious accident; and that was a more practical line to draw than any based on actual money calculations. There were figures which enabled them to test that view a little more closely. The Lancashire and Cheshire Miners' Permanent Relief Society, which embraced a very large number of men, reported that in the five years 1892–96 the total number of accidents of which particulars were furnished was 49,378. The number confined to the first two weeks was 11,961, between two and three weeks the number was 12,629, and between three and four weeks 7,160—a total of 31,750 out of 49,378. Therefore, if the Amendment was carried, the result would be to impose upon other sources from which compensation might be obtained a total liability which would amount to between 60 and 70 per cent. of the total number of accidents. By the provisions of the Bill the employers would be exempted from paying compensation in 11,961 cases, or about 22 per cent., which he thought was a very fair proportion. They were dealing with a class of men who they knew in many instances were earning only what they were obliged to spend week by week. It was only in the most favourable circumstances that the most thrifty of these men were able to save anything, and it was no fault of their own that many of them could not save much. When misfortune or sickness came they had no claim except upon the benefit societies, and had seldom anything to fall back upon. The Government, therefore, felt that in exempting the masters from the liability to pay compensation during a period of two weeks a substantial relief was given, while a system was adopted which would put fairly upon the workmen that portion of the burden which they ought to bear. It was said that by taking two weeks instead of four they would not be encouraging the friendly societies. All he could say was that if 22 per cent. of the accidents were left to the friendly societies it would be a considerable inducement to them to rearrange their funds with the view of giving perhaps larger allowances during the period of temporary disablement. If it was right to deal with the liability for all serious accidents in the way proposed by the Bill, he would be only too glad to find that the friendly societies were able to devote some of their funds, which were contributions of the men themselves, in giving larger allowonces for sickness and disasters not dealt with in the Bill. The Colonial Secretary had indicated to the Committee that the Government regarded Sub-section (*a*) as being a vital part of the Bill. They did not see any reason to change the period they had named, and unless they were shown that they were absolutely wrong they would feel it their duty to adhere to the period of two weeks.

*MR. J. WILSON (Durham) said the figures quoted by the Attorney General with regard to Lancashire and Cheshire coincided in a remarkable manner with figures which he had obtained in reference to the North of England Permanent Relief Society, and which showed that one-fourth of the accidents suffered by the miners there did not extend beyond the first two weeks. The hon. Member opposite had charged the working men generally with improvidence. He forgot that there were other liabilities and causes of men being out of work besides accidents. The men had to subscribe to sick benefit societies as well as permanent relief funds. Did the hon. Member suppose that the men would leave the friendly societies because of this proposed compensation, which could in no case exceed 50 per cent. of the wages? He would ask the hon. Member to address his lecture on foreign competition to the Home Secretary instead of to the working men representatives. They had never asked for this Bill. He should oppose the extension of the time for two weeks to four weeks, unless the hon. Member could induce the Government to agree to the compensation dating back from the occurrence of the accident. Then he would support the Amendment.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said that he differed entirely from the figures of the Attorney General. As far as he could learn, half the cost of injuries was in the first six weeks, and if a longer period were given, these benefit societies might continue. They gave the workman security against the insolvency of his employer, and an interest in his own insurance. There could be no doubt that eventually the effect of this Bill would fall on employers and workmen alike, but before that time there must be much friction. The principle hitherto had been that the workman assisted by the employers should insure himself, and wages had been settled on that basis. This Bill threw the whole burden on the employers. That meant an increase of wages at a time when it was not justified by the condition of trade. He thought that the workman should be a party to his own insurance, and that it was a retrograde step to relieve him of that duty.

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) was glad that the Government had spoken with no uncertain sound against the Amendment. [" Hear, hear ! "] The proposal of the Bill was passed on an intelligible principle. Every workman would have at least a week's wages due to him after he had sustained an accident. He would have at the very least, or at the very worst, half wages for a fortnight; but, if the period were extended the man would be placed in a very different position, he might be in absolute want, and the benefits of the Bill would be for him largely done away with.

MR. GALLOWAY asked whether, if a workman was disabled three weeks or for any period over two weeks, he would receive compensation for one week or for the three weeks?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied that the compensation would be paid only in respect of one week.

*MR. TOMLINSON referred to Mr. Neison's calculations, and said that he thought that there was some misapprehension as to the statements made by that gentleman. He denied that he had furnished the Home Office with statements inconsistent with those referred to by the hon. Member for St. Helens. Some facts collected by Mr. Neison had doubtless come before the Home Office, and some other gentleman had drawn some inferences from those facts which Mr. Neison disputed. For instance, Mr. Neison had undoubtedly stated that one-fifth of the accidents would be covered by the limit of two weeks, and the erroneous inference had been drawn at the Home Office that this limit of time disposed of one-fifth of the accidents; the fact being that owing to the greater costliness of the remaining accidents the two weeks only eliminate 5 per cent. in value of the accidents.

MR. SETON-KARR said that if he might be permitted to say so, both the hon. Member for Mid Durham and the Attorney General had made the same mistake. They had alsolutely disregarded the percentage of cost; and only treated the percentage of accident. But as this was a money compensation Bill, the question of cost was the only question worth considering.

MR. BAINBRIDGE said he regarded the Amendment as the most important that had been brought forward in connection with the Bill. Its effect would be to ease or reduce the strain thrown by the Bill upon the employer or upon the industry which the employer represented; and he therefore supported it. It was extremely important that the House should understand, and in regard to the coal trade — the industry which the Home Secretary had said would be most seriously affected by the Bill—the Bill meant an increased cost of two-pence per ton. The Attorney General had stated that there was very little difference between the effect of this Bill, and the effect of the Bill brought forward by the late Home Secretary. He controverted that statement in the strongest terms. He was an insurer of 12,000 or 15,000 men for the last 17 years under the present Employers' Liability Act; and the exact cost of the insurance was 1-32nd per cent. of the wages. The cost under the Bill of the late Home Secretary, if carried, would not have amounted to more than just twice as much as the cost under the Employer's Liability Act. In other words, the cost under the present Bill would be 2½ per cent., more than 80 times as much as the Employers' Liability Act; and 40 times as much as the late Home Secretary's Bill. This showed the extraordinary strain that would have to be borne by industry under the Bill; and it behoved them to try to reduce the strain as much as possible. He hoped the Government would think very seriously before they rejected this Amendment. He had been down to his constituency last Saturday, and spoke to a large employer of labour, who told him that, if this Bill passed, he would be obliged to discharge a large number of his young men. On asking him why, he replied that the Bill would encourage carelessness and neglect, and it was the younger men who displayed the most carelessness and neglect. That was a new light to him. He hoped the Government would not reject the Amendment, because it would tend to lighten the load on the employers, it would help to prevent a number of old men from being starved, and would support the maintenance of such societies as the Miners' Permanent Relief Fund.

Mr. HARDY said, in view of the position taken up by the Government, he did not propose to put the Committee to the trouble of a Division on the matter. Personally, he felt a very strong inclination to accept the suggestion from the other side of the House with reference to four weeks, but he did not feel justified, without consideration, in altering his Amendment. He assured the Committee that he brought forward the Amendment, not from any desire to take away from the compensation of the men, but rather with the view of making them work better when the Bill passed. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. RENSHAW moved, in Paragraph (*a*) Sub-section (2), after the word "*weeks*," to insert the words "immediately subsequent to the injury."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN hoped the Amendment would not be pressed, as it was easy to conceive cases of accident where the injury was not discovered till some time afterwards.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BOUSFIELD moved, in Sub-section (2), after the words "Provided that," to insert the words:—

"he shall not be so liable if he shall be a member of a trade association in the management of which employers and workmen shall have equal representation, and shall have contributed to the funds of such association an amount not less than the amount contributed by his workmen to such funds."

It was very desirable that these funds should, if possible, be administered through trade organisations. That, undoubtedly, would lead to economy in working, just as it was frequently found that a body elected by the people was more economical than a body which was not controlled in any way. If initially there were contributions by the workmen towards the expenses of compensation—

Mr. PICKARD, rising to order, asked whether the hon. and learned Gentleman's remarks were relevant to the Bill?

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS thought the Amendment was in order.

Mr. BOUSFIELD said it was perhaps a little difficult to gather from his Amendment what was its exact scope. It seemed to him that in the administration of these funds it was essential that they should have the assistance of the workmen, and that the workmen should, in the first place, contribute to the funds. His suggestion was that in the case of the Lanarkshire coal fields, for instance, there should be a Mining Board, that that Board should be elected, and should consist of an equal number of employers' and workmen's representatives; that they should have power to form a fund to which employers and workmen should contribute in equal shares, and that they should have the dispensing of that fund. If they had a body of that sort, responsible for the collection and administration of the fund, there would be the great advantage that those interested in the administration would know all about the necessities of the people who from time to time would be injured. There would be the further advantage that they would get rid of the difficulty of the possible bankruptcy of the employer. The association would represent a large area, and the fund would be practically incapable of being bankrupt. Further, there would be the great advantage that they would have the employers and workmen working together in harmony. He was satisfied that such a scheme as he proposed in this matter would tend to the happy solution of many trade difficulties in other matters.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said there was no doubt that, if the object which this Bill sought to attain could be secured without legislation, it would be a very desirable state of things. As far as he understood the Amendment, his hon. and learned Friend really proposed to substitute for the proposals of the Bill a very vague system of what was generally called contracting out. He did not for a moment deny that it would be extremely desirable if trade associations could be formed all over the country in which, by the mutual co-operation of employers and employed, the various claims which might be made upon them could be satisfactorily met. The contracting out clause of the Bill was a more liberal and generous one than that of his hon. and learned Friend, and, whether the Committee considered it a right or a wrong one when it came under discussion, he hardly thought they would be prepared to accept the present Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"] Certainly the Government could not accept it. ["Hear, hear!"]

Amendment negatived.

MR. HALDANE (Haddington) moved, in paragraph (*b*), Sub-section (1), to leave out the words:—

> "When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible."

He said the words proposed to be left out provided that the common law liability of the employer was to continue when, and only when, it had been decided by the arbitrator that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act and default of the employer or some person for whose act and default the employer was responsible. He wished to point out that these words were inconsistent with what he understood was the purpose for which the Bill was introduced. It was introduced with a view to confer upon the workmen a new system of compensation. To the employer there was to be left the burden of such civil liability as already existed. The clause, as drawn, was not consistent with that. Let him take a concrete and simple illustration. Supposing a very common sort of accident. Machinery was fenced, but through the negligence, but not the wilful or wrongful negligence, of the employer or his superintendent, imperfectly fenced. The fencing gives way, and the man lost a couple of fingers. He was laid aside for a fortnight, at the end of which time he came back with his arm in a sling. He was able to work his machine, he was not permanently incapacitated within the meaning of the schedule, although he was a worse man. It might be that through some similar cause, through the negligence, but not the wilful wrong of the employer, he had lost an eye. He was not permanently incapacitated from doing his work, but what was his position? Before the Bill passed into law he would have been able to have recovered against his employer compensation in the shape of the damages which the Employers' Liability Act gave him, but in this clause they had taken away that right without giving anything to take its place. He could recover compensation under this Bill, but only if he came within the provisions of the schedule. In the case he had put—and it was quite a common case—by the provision which constituted the beginning of this sub-section, he was disabled from recovering under the law as it now stood. He could not get compensation under the Bill, and he could not get compensation under the Employers' Liability Act, because this Bill had cut down the cases in which he could claim under that law, to cases in which there had been a wilful and wrongful act on the part of the employer.

In that class of cases, he said, the workman was distinctly worse off than he was under the existing law. They were cutting out from compensation a large class of accidents—he admitted they were smaller accidents—without any justification so far as he could see. It was perfectly true that the employer was to bear a larger burden than at present. That was in pursuance of the Government's policy, but why should they take from this class of person who had suffered injury the rights which he had at the present time? He would also like to ask what was the meaning of the words "wilful and wrongful." They were not known to lawyers. He was always delighted when legal phraseology could be departed from, and things could be expressed in plain terms —[*Ministerial cheers*]—but unfortunately such was the infirmity of the human mind that stereotyped phrases did get an ascertained meaning, and when new ones were started they opened up a large and vexatious field of questions for the Courts to decide; and of this he was convinced, that if these words were left in the clause, and if these questions were reserved for the arbitrator, they would be opening up a new field of litigation. [" Hear, hear ! "] For these reasons he begged to move the omission of the words to which the Amendment referred.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said he would be glad if his hon. and learned Friend would tell the Committee in whose interest this Amendment was proposed. He was certain it would not conduce to the interest of the workman, but would manifestly conduce to the interest of the lawyers. [*Laughter.*] The illustration which his hon. and learned Friend gave was altogether inconsistent with his line of argument. He supposed the case of a workman who had lost two fingers and an eye, or two fingers or an eye—he was not sure sure which—and he assumed that this man would recover from this injury in a fortnight. All he could say was that if he did it would be a most wonderful recovery. [*Laughter.*] The hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that this man would not be permanently incapacitated. He did not think the word "permanently" occurred in the Bill. The words were "in case of incapacity for work," and to say that a man who had lost two fingers or an eye would not be to some extent incapacitated for work seemed to him quite contrary to the probable facts of the case. ["Hear, hear."] He did not think it was true to say that a workman in that position would not be able to get compensation under the Bill. What would be the effect of the Amendment? The Government were endeavouring to do away with litigation. The one case they considered to be outside the purview of the Bill was the case to which reference had been made continually—of wilful and wrongful default on the part of the employer. The hon. Gentleman complained that those were not legal words, but them he could discuss on a subsequent Amendment. What the Government meant was perfectly clear. They meant to do what they said—[" hear, hear ! "]—the wilful and wrongful act of the employer, which would justify them in imposing on him a different liability to that imposed by the Bill. His hon. and learned Friend proposed that in every case of accident it should be an open question whether the workman took advantage of the Bill or whether he took some other proceedings—that was to say, he was going to open the whole opportunity of litigation in every case that occurred under the Bill. In every single case the workman under the sort of inducement that was brought to bear on him was to leave all the certain and definite advantages of the Bill and was to engage in expensive litigation, which would be undertaken as a speculative matter by somebody on his part with the certainty that if he won, very little if any, of the compensation recovered would go into his pocket. ["Hear, hear."]

That was entirely opposed to the object and intention of the Bill, and it would be quite impossible to consent to the Amendment. ["Hear, hear."]

MR. WALTON said that the proposals of the Government were most remarkable in their nature and without precedent, inasmuch as they set up a double form of procedure for ascertaining the rights of the parties whose interests were involved. Let him indicate shortly what he thought were grave and conclusive objections to this proposal of the Government. In the first place, let them consider the tribunal which was to decide the issue on which he civil and criminal *status* of every employer was to depend. Let them consider the nature of the tribunal, and consider the justice of leaving the employer to face its investigation with the danger of a subsequent criminal indictment hanging over his head. It was said that he had been guilty of some eglect of duty, that he had been wilfully and wrongfully negligent, either in the engagement of his workmen or in the arrangement or management of his works. That issue had first of all to be determined by a secret tribunal under the name of arbitration, sitting without the afeguards of legal procedure, holding its inquiry without the guarantee of publicity. Assume an adverse verdict. That verdict would entitle the workman or his representatives to indict his employer perhaps for manslaughter. Imagine a man going before a jury on uch a charge when already involved by he verdict of this extraordinary tribunal. What chance would he have? Then, in he matter of civil responsibility, what sort f a chance of a fair trial would an emloyer have when sued in a Court of Common Law after the workman had got the erdict of the arbitrator that the conduct f his employer had been wilfully negligent? That was the provision from the mployer's point of view. Let them look it from the workman's point of view—r he submitted it was important in the interest of both parties that this portion of the Government scheme should be reconsidered. The Colonial Secretary had again reminded them that the whole object of the Bill was to avoid litigation. Well, the operation of this provision was to insure that there should be at least two suits in regard to every case in which the workman sought to establish his claim to a larger measure of compensation than the Bill awarded. He had first of all to enter on arbitration. The Colonial Secretary, in his happy innocence of the working of legal procedure, seemed to be under the impression that arbitration was simpler, shorter, and cheaper than legal action. Some of them had had experience of both processes, law and arbitration, and they had been painfully driven to precisely the opposite conclusion. ["Hear, hear!"] They had learnt that arbitration was longer and more costly and was profoundly unsatisfactory. Yet they drove the workman, dissatisfied perhaps with the niggardly compensation given him, to incur the cost of this litigation by arbitration; and then, having spent his resources on the preliminary struggle, they launched him on a course of litigation in the Courts of Common Law. He submitted that from both the employer and the workman's point of view this portion of the Government scheme was open to the greatest objection. Let him remind the Committee of the assurances given on the First and Second Readings. They were told that this was an enabling scheme; that it took away nothing and gave everything; that the workman would have the option of either proceeding under the Bill or under the Employers' Liability Act or at common law. Why did not the Government have the courage to adhere to these assurances, and give the workman full power of deciding under which scheme of relief he should proceed in order to assert his remedy? He did not see why a workman should be coerced to adopt one mode of procedure, and should be prevented from selecting others, and he believed that unless the Government made some concession on this point, the beneficial operation of the Bill would be materially diminished.

MR. THOMAS BUCKNILL (Surrey, Epsom) doubted whether his hon. and learned Friend opposite had read the clause very attentively. The object of the clause, according to the Home Secretary, was to give to the workman an additional opportunity of recovering as against his employer. Where an employer had been guilty of a wilful or wrongful act or default, either by himself or by some person for whom he was responsible, the injured man would be able to avail himself of three remedies. He could proceed under this Bill or under the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, or under the common law. He did not understand how any one could argue seriously that the clause was disadvantageous to the workmen, to whose rights it certainly added something.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) did not think that the Colonial Secretary intended that a workman should always have his remedy at common law, under Lord Campbell's Act, or under the Employers' Liability Act, at his option. What he understood was that a workman was only to have a remedy outside the Bill in the case of what was inartistically called "the wilful or wrongful act or default" of the employer. The provision under censure would, he feared, be inoperative and futile. What they wanted to do was to save workmen and employers the cost of litigation, and the proposal of the Government was that the workman should proceed by arbitration, but it was obvious that the workman must have a right to the services of counsel, a solicitor and witnesses. It was perfectly obvious that somebody must pay the cost of the counsel, solicitor, and witnesses. On whom was the cost to lie? It was to lie upon the unsuccessful party. In certain cases the workman would be the unsuccessful party. He would be the unsuccessful party if he failed in showing that this particular injury of which he complained did not fall within the scope of the Act. Would he then have to pay the costs of the arbitration? If so, how would he have to pay it. Would it be deducted from the amount he had to receive, or otherwise? But supposing he was successful in his contention and established that the case did not come within the Act, what had he got to do then after going through all the expense of arbitration? He had got to bring his action, and if he established that it was not an employment within the Act—which he was anxious to do because he could get a larger compensation if it was an employment outside the Act—he proceeded with his case, and there was a second trial to decide whether or not he was entitled to receive compensation under the common law or under the Statute. Why, he asked, for the sake of economy and expediency, should not the workman enjoy the same rights to litigate any question which might arise between him and his employer that he had at the present time? Supposing a workman elected to bring an action under the Employers' Liability Act or the common law. He brought the action before the Judge of the County Court, or the Judge of the High Court under Lord Campbell's Act, and the Judge of the High Court coming to the conclusion that it was not a case for compensation under Lord Campbell's Act or the Employers' Liability Act non-suited the plaintiff. He had only thereby gone through precisely the same operation as he would *mutatis mutandis* by going through arbitration. He had had a procedure cheaper and more expeditious before the County Court Judge in which he was unsuccessful, whereas *mutatis mutandis* he would have procedure before the arbitrator more expensive and protracted had a similar necessity arisen that he should go to law. It should be open to the workman to bring his action, if he had a right of action, so that the matter must be disposed of there and then and justice meted out to one or other of the parties at a cost which was very much less than it would be by the method of arbitration. He was at a loss to understand why all this machinery of arbitration had been created, the only effect of which would be that in the vast majority of cases in which accidents happened, there would be presented to the workman, hanging over him as a sort of threat *in terrorem*, the prospect of being dragged to arbitration. He did not wish to say a single word against the employers, who for the most part acted justly to their workmen. But in the vast majority of cases the employers would insure and it would not be the workman meeting face to face his employer. It would be the workman meeting face to face the agent of the insurance company, who would interpose every obstructive tactic and have recourse to every device which might possibly tend to intimidate the workman. He declared that under this arbitration clause the Government were simply opening the door to the insurance offices using the arbitration proceedings as a means of terrorising workmen and preventing them getting justice. For these reasons he very cordially supported the Amendment, and he was sure there was not a single workman represented in that House who would not entirely concur in the view that it was much better to leave him to his present remedy *plus* the advantage derived from this Bill, rather than compel him to try in every case whether or not he had a right to compensation.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said that a contrast had been drawn between the expense of the Courts and the expense of arbitration. Having had some experience of the last-named tribunal, he said that if he thought prolonged sittings and expense entailed by counsel and witnesses were likly to arise, he should be the first to agree to the suggestion which had been made. But he referred his hon. and learned Friends to the schedule of the Bill, from which it would be seen that this was not the class of arbitration which had to be considered. Who was the arbitrator to be? He was to be the County Court Judge, and it was not contemplated, if the County Court Judge could not take the case, that the usual County Court fees should be paid by the parties interested in the hearing of the case. Therefore the arbitration contemplated was intended to be something in the nature of a domestic forum which should settle matters in a cheap and expeditious manner. It was said that they ought to leave the workman in every case in the same position as he was now, and should give him the right to sue at common law under the Employers' Liability Act, or under this Bill; but one of the objects of the Bill in putting an end to litigation would be defeated altogether. ["Hear, hear!"] Their endeavour was to make it the interest of the workmen to adopt the cheapest and most expeditious way of having their compensation assessed. If some such machinery as the Bill contemplated was not adopted, workmen who thought that they could possibly get a large amount would be tempted to take the employer into Court and to frame a double claim against him. The result would be that there would be absolutely no inducement to adopt the cheaper course, and the workmen would find themselves perhaps largely in the hands of not too scrupulous legal advisers, who advised them to go into Court because they might get a remedy in some shape or other, and on the expectation that employers would have to pay the cost. The scheme of the Bill was simple. The workman said, "I do not wish to be tied to the pecuniary limits of this Bill; I think I can show that my case comes within the provisions which entitle me to a larger amount." If hon. Gentlemen said that this question also would be decided by the arbitrator, well and good; let them suggest Amendments to that effect; but if it was desired that the workman should still have a right to say, "I desire to have my damages assessed, not by the arbitrator, not by the County Court Judge, but by some one else," then it was necessary that there should be some ready means of determining whether he possessed those rights. He regarded the words as a practical means of getting the question speedily determined before further litigation were entered upon.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS supported the Amendment, because the words if allowed to remain would not only repeal part of the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, but prevent the criminal law from being put in motion against an employer in cases where he was responsible. Parliament decided 17 years ago that in certain events the employer should be liable to the workman to a much more considerable extent than under the provisions of the Bill. The Government had told the Committee that they did not deal with employers' liability under the Bill. He agreed that the questions of employers' liability and compensation were distinct matters. But by the inclusion of the words they would repeal parts of the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and make it impossible for the workman in any of the events prescribed under the Employers' Liability Act to take any proceedings unless beforehand he went to an arbitrator or a Committee of employers and employed, and then, in the event of disagreement, to the County Court Judge. The Colonial Secretary said they were not attempting to deal with the punitive side of the Measure, and that if it could be shown that employers should be punished, there was no reason why they should not. If an employer, in the opinion of an employé, had been guilty of manslaughter, the criminal law could not be put in motion against him. A Commitee must first be appealed to, and if they did not decide, he must go to the County Court Judge. If the words remained in the Bill, the workman would be unable to put into force the criminal law under the Factories Act or the Coal Mines Regulation Act without the decision of this Committee, and the opinion of the County Court Judge. This diminished the remedy of the employé civilly and criminally in an important respect, and he entirely agreed with the Amendment that the remedies which already existed in favour of the workman civilly and criminally might continue to exist in his favour.

Mr. W. R. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) thought the suggestion of the Attorney General showed a way out of a real difficulty and hardship under this section—that was to say, that the arbitrator should have power to give the compensation on the higher scale. If the Amendment were withdrawn, perhaps before to-morrow the Government would be able to put the hon. and learned Gentleman's suggestion into shape and the difficulty would be removed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that, of course, if that view met one of the difficulties he should be glad to consider it. He did not deal with the question of criminal liability, because that did not arise as the question was put from the Chair, but with that of civil liability. On the point of simplifying procedure, he would be happy to consult with the Home Secretary.

Mr. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthen, E.) was very much in favour of the Amendment, as, having had a very large experience in cases connected with the Employers' Liability Act, he thought it would be a terrible thing to send these cases to an arbitrator instead of leaving them to the ordinary tribunals. How in the world was it to save money, to have the County Court Judge in his private room instead of in his own Court? He had never been in an arbitration in his life in which the costs were not vastly higher than those of the High Court or the County Court.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN hoped the hon. and learned Member would be willing to withdraw his Amendment upon the understanding that the Government were quite willing at a later period to consider the questions which had been raised in connection with the Amendment, but which were not determined by it. These questions were whether the words "wilful and wrongful default" were the best description of the particular kind of negligence which they wished to strike at; whether the words criminal liability were properly inserted in the clause; and whether they would, in fact, involve the decision by a County Court Judge as to whether a workman would or would not have a criminal remedy; and questions concerning the expenses of the arbitration. All these questions were open for consideration, and could be discussed at a later period, and the Government would certainly favourably view Amendments which had the object and were likely to have the result of simplifying procedure and cheapening it at the same time.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES asked whether, if the Amendment were withdrawn, it would be possible subsequently to move another to eliminate the arbitration clause?

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I should like to see the Amendment first.

Mr. ASQUITH recognised the conciliatory manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the question, and he should be disposed to advise his hon. Friend to withdraw his Amendment on the undertaking of the Government that they were going to consider the various questions which the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned. But there ought to be a clear understanding that the withdrawal was not to prejudice their right to raise the contention that the workman ought to have reserved to him as complete a right and as complete remedies against the employer in all cases of negligence as he had at present. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. HALDANE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. S. EVANS (Glamorgan, S.) desired to point out the difficulty in which the hon. and learned Member would find himself if the Amendment were withdrawn. If it was decided that, "as hereinafter provided," should remain, they would have limiting words in the Bill. He objected to the Amendment being withdrawn unless upon the clear understanding and undertaking of the Government that it was not their intention to prevent a workman having recourse to any of the remedies which he had now for civil damages, or to prevent him from prosecuting criminally, if he thought fit. He warned his hon. Friend not to be caught too readily by conciliatory speeches made by the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. ASQUITH said he understood that the question remained entirely open, and that the words "as hereinafter provided," would not in the least degree prejudice the question.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman of Ways and Means left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES].

Committee thereupon deferred till To-morrow.

LABOUR BUREAUX BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 29th June.

PARISH REGISTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

CHURCH PATRONAGE TRANSFER BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

SHOPS (EARLY CLOSING) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

TROUT FISHING CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 2nd June.

SALE OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

SHOP ASSISTANTS (HALF-HOLIDAY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

MARKET GARDENERS' COMPENSATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read the Third time and passed.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till Thursday.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

House Adjourned at a Quarter after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 26th May 1897.

COMMITTEES (ASCENSION DAY).

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) moved "That Committees do not meet to-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the clock."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that he must protest this year, as he did last, against this Motion, which was exceedingly unfair to those who were engaged in Committee work. The very important Committee on Fair Wages and the Government Contracts Committee sat to-morrow, but if this Motion were agreed to it would practically be a day lost, although it was very desirable that those Committees should report at the earliest possible moment. With regard to the other Committees dealing with private Bills, witnesses were brought up from the country, and if this Motion were carried the result would be that a day's expenses would be added to the already enormous cost of Private Bill procedure. He did not wish to prevent anyone who desired to do so from attending a place of worship to-morrow, but it was perfectly well known that the Motion was not really made for the purpose of enabling hon. Members to attend a place of worship. ["Oh, oh!"] Last year the Speaker had ruled out of order an Amendment which he now submitted in the form of a suggestion—namely, that any Member desiring to attend a place of worship should submit the matter to his colleagues on the Committee, who might decide not to sit on Ascension Day. He felt so strongly on the subject that he should certainly take a Division on the Motion.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.), regretted the opposition which the Motion annually met with in that House. The celebration of Ascension Day was recognised as one of the cardinal points of the Christian faith, and he regretted that anybody should be found to stand up in that House, and practically deny the Ascension of our Lord. [*Loud cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member ought to withdraw that observation. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. JOHNSTON said that he withdrew the expression at once, and apologised to the House if he had used an expression which grated upon the feelings of any hon. Member in the least degree. He felt so strongly on this matter himself that he could not refrain from entering a protest against the opposition to this Motion, and must express his profound regret that any one in that House should be found to oppose it. ["Hear, hear!"]

The House divided—Ayes, 162; Noes, 51.—(Division List, No. 217.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Considered in Committee [Progress, 25th May.]

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

LIABILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO WORKMEN FOR INJURIES.

(1.) If in any employment to which this Act applies personal injury by accident, arising out of and in the course of the employment, is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act.

(2.) Provided that:—

(*a*) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least *two weeks* from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed;

(*b*) When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible nothing in this Act shall affect any liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act, except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

(3.) If any question arises as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies, or whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer, or of any person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, or whether the injury was caused by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment of the workman injured, or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, or other wise as to the liability for compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement, shall, subject to the provisions of the first schedule to this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the second schedule to this Act.

(4.) If the Registrar of Friendly Societies certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment is, on the whole, not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of this Act, the employer may, until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of those workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act, and thereupon the employer shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme, but, save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply, notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool), said that he rose to make a statement arising out of the proceedings in Committee last night.

MR. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) rose on a point of order. He wished to ask whether there was any question before the Committee? [*Ministerial cries of* "Order, order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The Minister in charge of a Bill is always entitled to make a statement. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. PICKERSGILL said that the point of order he had in view was this. If the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which was obviously of an important character, was to be made, would it not be proper that hon. Members should have an opportunity of commenting upon it, and would it not be more in order that a Motion for reporting progress should be made, and that then the right hon. Gentleman should make his statement?

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: It is a very common practice for the Minister in charge of a Bill to make a statement whenever a convenient opportunity arises.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that he asked the leave of the Committee to propose an Amendment to Clause 1, which he believed would in effect cover the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Haddington. It had been promised at the close of the discussion last night that the Government would see how they could meet the objections which had been raised to the clause on two or three points. Those points were the use of the words "the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer," and the inclusion by the words "civil or criminal" of the possibility that the arbitrator would be able to bar the right of a workman under the Common Law or under the Employers' Liability Act 1880, to bring an action. The Government had promised to consider how they could make it clear that that was not the intention of the clause or of the Government. The intention, as he had said on the previous night, was to secure that in the case of the personal negligence of the employer himself or of those for whose act or default he was responsible, the workman should have the same remedy as he possessed under the present law. The Government now desired to make that clear, and with that object it was proposed that Sub-section (*b*) should read as follows:—

"When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that injury caused by the personal negligence or the wilful act of the employer or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any civil liability of the employer, but in that case the amount of damages due from such employer may, at the request of the person claiming compensation, be settled by arbitration in accordance with the second schedule of this Act, or may, at the option of such person, be recovered from such employer by the same proceedings as were open to such person before the commencement of this Act."

Then came the concluding words of the sub-section,

"But the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default."

It was believed that these words expressed clearly the intentions of the Government, and it was hoped that they would meet to a certain extent, if not entirely, the objections raised at the close of the discussion last night.

Sir R. T. REID (Dumfries Burghs) regarded the statement as very important relative to two questions—first, as to what was to be the effect of the Bill upon the rights of the workman against the employer, and in the next place as to the choice of the tribunal. At present it was difficult to say whether the words suggested did leave absolutely unimpaired the existing rights of the workman. He desired to make it perfectly clear that not one of these rights should be in the least degree impaired or interfered with. The Amendment proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Haddingtonshire (Mr. Haldane) was a more simple method of arriving at the second point. He was completely in accord with the Home Secretary, nothing was more valuable in this Bill than the provision as to arbitration. He believed that some simple and inexpensive machinery should be provided. It struck him that the right hon. Gentleman might well deal with the next clause so as to provide that all questions of liability, whether under this Bill, the Employers' Liability Act, or the common law should be referred to arbitration.

Mr. C. A. CRIPPS (Gloucester, Stroud) said he agreed with every word said by the hon. Member for Dumfries. The effect of the Amendment would not be to send matters to arbitration but the contrary. He considered the Amendment unfortunate as opening the door for litigation, whereas he had understood that the essence of the Bill was to introduce a principle of limited liability to be ascertained by a new and easy method of procedure. By this proposal the limit of liability was taken away. He thought it right to state at once from the Government side of the House that they did not desire to open the flood-gates of litigation, which would be the effect of this Amendment. It took away the necessity of bringing matters before the arbitrator, and gave the alternative of litigation. Now, was that desired or not?

Mr. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) pointed out that he had put down an Amendment to insert at the beginning of Clause 5 (Commencement of Act and Short Title) the words:—

> "All claims for compensation for accidents by workmen or their representatives against employers, whether under the Employers' Liability Act 1880, at common law or otherwise, shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the second schedule of this Act."

He was anxious to know whether it would be in order to discuss that Amendment at the present time?

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS said the discussion at the present time ought not to go beyond the Amendment now before the Committee. He could not say that a discussion upon the Amendment which the hon. Member had down some 11 pages on would not be relevant. He would be in a better position to decide when they reached the Amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight) assured his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stroud that the Government had not departed in the slightest degree from the principle of the Bill. The principle of the Bill still was limited liability in all cases which were mentioned as coming under the remedy of the Bill. Last night it was pointed out that they contemplated by Sub-section (3) that the arbitrator should be entitled to determine whether or not there had been such default of the employer as justified the workman in obtaining larger damages than the limited amount the Bill would give him. It was also pointed out that the workman would of necessity be sent to another Court. He suggested that, instead of forcing the workman to go to another Court, power should be given to the arbitrator to assess the damages—nothing more than that. From both sides of the House the observation came that if the arbitrator could deal with the matter the difficulty would be removed. He would have no objection to the arbitrator dealing with all cases—["hear, hear!"]—but the Government felt that if the power to go to the County Court Judge was one the workman appreciated, they saw no reason why they should take that power away from him. All they had done was to say that, if the arbitrator found that the employer was liable for a larger amount of compensation than the limit specified in the Bill, the person claiming the compensation might then and there ask the arbitrator to fix the amount. They added the words, "or at the option of persons claiming," so that the workman might go to the same tribunal as at present. No one could suggest that they did that for the purpose of encouraging litigation. They did it with the object of providing a ready and speedy means of assessing the compensation. What was the other alteration they had made? Objection was taken to the words, "wilful or wrongful act or default of the employer," and the Home Secretary undertook to consider whether or not the meaning could be better expressed. There was to be considered the personal negligence of others besides the master. There was, for instance, the case of a company where there was a general manager or some responsible person, and accordingly they had adopted the words which were practically those of the Employers' Liability Act—namely:—

> "Personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible."

They believed they had reserved to the workman by those words every case which would come within the Employers' Liability Act. They had not given the workman any greater rights than he had before. Personally he should not have the smallest objection to the last part of the Amendment being left out, but it did not seem to him they could oppose that without the general assent of the Committee, because they were pledged to hon. Gentlemen opposite to preserve to the workman such rights as he now had if he wished to exercise them.

Mr. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) said they were at considerable disadvantage in discussing an Amendment which they had never seen in print, and he felt sure the Government would agree that, whatever form of words was adopted, they should, on the Report stage, have an opportunity of seeing whether the intention had been correctly and technically expressed. ["Hear, hear!"] The important point now was that they should be at one as to the intention they meant to embody in the Bill, and he had some hope, after hearing the speech of the Attorney General, that they might arrive at an identity of view. He was glad to hear his hon. and learned Friend refute the construction put upon the Amendment by the hon. and learned Member for Stroud. He did not believe it was ever the intention of the Government that the remedy given by the Bill should be an exclusive remedy, and that the common law or statutory rights the workman had already, if they gave him a better remedy than that provided by the Bill, should be cut down. If the workman was to remain in possession of all the rights—he would not say remedies—which he had at present, and if the compensation provided by the Bill was an alternative right, he did not think there would be any difficulty in embodying that in proper phraseology. He went further. If the question was to be submitted in the first instance to the arbitrator, he thought it would be far better that the arbitrator should retain complete seizing of the case from beginning to end. ["Hear, hear!"] He could not see any justification for first submitting the case to the arbitrator, and then, if the arbitrator came to a particular decision, remitting the parties to litigation. ["Hear, hear!"]

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) said he entirely accepted what the right hon. Gentleman had just said. Of course, it would be open to any Member of the Committee to criticise the wording of the proposed Amendment on the Report stage. In the meantime, he believed they had arrived at a substantial identity of view. He believed that an hon. Member opposite had suggested that they should do away with the alternatives which they had allowed to remain in the Bill. That was a very important suggestion, to which personally he was not at all unfavourable, but he assumed that what would be desired was that the Amendment now proposed should be carried, and if they found in the interval between now and the report stage that that was the general view of the House, they should then omit the latter portion of the Amendment. He could not help thinking that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stroud had not entirely appreciated the point in reference to which he addressed the House. They always intended that questions affecting the personal negligence of the employer should be dealt with by alternative methods. It was perfectly true that the essence of the Bill was, with regard to the vast proportion of the accidents which would come under it, that there should be no choice for either the workman or employer but to take their position under the Bill. But they always made an exception in the cases in which it was alleged that the accident was due to the personal negligence of the employer. Those were a very small proportion of the accidents, but as to that proportion they did intend that the rights of the workman should remain absolutely unimpaired. He was not only to have this new option of taking his position, without discussion, under the Bill, but he would have, if he preferred it, any of the other rights which he would have now under the Employers' Liability Act, Lord Campbell's Act, or the common law. He believed that was clearly expressed in the Amendment.

Mr. HAROLD TENNANT (Berwickshire) pointed out that under Section 82 of the Factory Act of 1878 an employer was liable, in the case of a person killed or one who suffered personal injury, to a fine not exceeding £100. Would that be touched at all by the present provision?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said it was not touched.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) looked with some degree of alarm on the choice which was to be given to the workman either to take action under the old Act or under the present Bill so far as compensation was concerned. Those who knew how these matters were dealt with knew perfectly well that very often a workman was perfectly incompetent himself to come to a decision as to which course he should adopt. Very often he fell into the hands of a solicitor who looked more to his own interests than to those of his client, and what he was afraid of was that, if this option was given, in many cases the advice of the solicitor would be to proceed by that method which was likely to sweep the most into his own net. He would be much better pleased if all civil claims under both these Acts could be settled by arbitration. He was sure that ultimately that would be in the interests of the workmen themselves, and that it would tend to make the Bill work much more smoothly.

Mr. C. B. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) said he viewed with very great apprehension what had fallen from his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stroud, and it seemed to him that this proposal was going to throw a very grave additional disability on to the employers. He thought that one great feature of this Bill was that they were going to avoid litigation and get rid of the confusion of issues. But now, as it seemed to him, an employer of labour was not only liable to go before the arbitrator, but he had also the prospect of the arbitrator turning the case back to a court of law, and then to have the whole question threshed out again. Speaking as an employer of labour, he would far rather see the possibility of alternative methods reduced as much as might be. He thought the employers of the country would wish to understand clearly and distinctly what their liability and responsibility were under the Bill.

Mr. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) asked if the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper was in order?

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS said it was clearly incompetent for him to accept such an Amendment as that which the hon. Member had on the Paper, because that would be amending the common law, the Employers' Liability Act, and Lord Campbell's Act. That was out of order on this Bill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL wished to point out that the Home Secretary's Amendment dealt with two questions—the question of procedure and the question of substantive law. So far as procedure was concerned, the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion seemed to provide a feasible way out of a difficulty; but he was extremely anxious upon the second point. The Colonial Secretary said it was the intention of the Government to maintain all the existing substantive rights of the workman against the employer. But the question was whether, that being the intention of the Government, the words before them carried out that intention? He was afraid they did not. As he understood, a condition precedent to claiming under the existing law was that a workman should establish the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer or of some person for whom he was responsible. He had a great jealousy of the introduction of the adjective into Acts of Parliament. He would like to know why the word "personal" was introduced before the word "negligence." There was no such adjective in the Employers' Liability Act of 1880. He accepted it that the Government were not prepared to cut down in any way the existing rights; then let them have what they were well acquainted with, the word "negligence" pure and simple, and do not introduce the word "personal." The other words were "wilful act." He objected very strongly to the introduction of those words. As he understood a trespass was not necessarily wilful.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL explained that the reason why "wilful act" was inserted was because, in the opinion of a very competent draftsman, it was doubtful whether trespass was negligence.

MR. PICKERSGILL said there seemed to be reason in what the hon. and learned Attorney General had said. He wished to emphasise the fact that the Government had expressed their distinct intention to preserve intact the existing liabilities of the employer towards his workpeople.

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) thought the Bill was very well as it stood. Its effect would be to discourage litigation altogether, and it was not unreasonable that if the workman was not satisfied with the generous provision made in the Bill, some difficulties might reasonably be placed in his way. But the present proposal of the Government, as he understood it, was that supposing a workman was not satisfied with the provisions of the Bill, and wished to go for an unlimited amount of compensation, he should be at liberty either to go to the ordinary courts of law or to take the decision of an arbitrator. Look at the position of the unfortunate employer. He might have claims against him not by one workman, but by a number of workmen, all under the same conditions and circumstances, which might amount to £70,000 or £80,000. He did not think any prudent man would engage in a business where he might be liable to claims of such an enormous amount, which should be submitted, without his consent, to a tribunal like an arbitrator. The proposal seemed to be monstrous, and the result would be to deter people going into a business where that was possible.

MR. ALEXANDER URE (Linlithgow) said the question had been discussed from the practising lawyer's point of view. The Committee was apt to forget that an employer's liability for negligence applied not only to the negligence of a foreman, but also to that of people placed in charge of machinery, and also to defects in works and plant. The result of any reference to statutory liability in the Bill would be this—that when an accident occurred, the workman would have his choice of two remedies. He would be entitled to go into Court with all the lamentable results hon. Members were so unanimous in deploring, instead of going to the arbitrator, as they were all agreed he ought to do. If all reference to statutory liability was left out, that misfortune, he thought, would be avoided, and no injustice would be done to the workman. Because, under the Employers' Liability Act, the amount of compensation a workman could recover was confined to an average of three years' wages; therefore, under that Statute he would not be able to recover any more compensation than he would under this Bill. Accordingly, they left the workman with a right to recover more money, but by a process that was disastrous to the employer. By leaving out all reference to statutory liability, they would preserve the principle of the Bill, which, as the Colonial Secretary had clearly explained that day, was to preserve full and large remedies to the workman against the employer where the personal liability should be laid on the employer's shoulders, but to limit his liability in all other cases. The omission of any reference to statutory liability would make clear the amended proposal of the Government, and produce a clause which, he thought, would meet with the unanimous approbation of the Committee.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Stockport) said it was inconvenient to discuss the clause without having its words before them; yet, if they refrained, they practically eliminated one of the stages of the Bill as far as this particular clause was concerned. The clause was far-reaching in effect. It gave the workmen further facilities, and took away from the employer certain opportunities of appealing against a decision involving him, perhaps, in heavy damages. That was a step the House ought not to take without very serious consideration. They were all willing to facilitate the compensation of workmen, and were all desirous of reducing litigation to the smallest amount. At the same time, they had the employer to consider, and it would not do, in creating a new liability, to take away from the employer his present safeguard against being unfairly mulct in heavy damages at common law or under the Employers' Liability Act.

Mr. CRIPPS said the view which he took of the proposal before the Committee was that the Government intended to leave all the existing remedies unimpaired, and to give an alternative remedy in the Bill. If that was their intention, he protested against it, for it would open the gates to litigation instead of providing for the alternative method of arbitration. The proposal would be destructive of one of the best features of the Bill, which established one remedy only—that of arbitration, with a limited amount.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanark, Partick) asked the Government to make it clear what their real meaning was. He could not understand whether they were at one with the right hon. Gentleman opposite or differed from. The Colonial Secretary just now alluded to one class of liability. Under the existing Act there were two classes in which the workman could obtain his remedy. There was the class in which the employer had been guilty of personal and direct negligence; and the provision of this Bill—a provision which, he thought, met with universal acceptance—was that the previously existing rights of the workmen should not be taken away. But there was another class, in which the workman could obtain compensation under the existing law, but in which there was no kind of moral responsibility on the employer's part. As the Bill stood, it was clear that in this class of case the remedy of the workman was taken away, for he could not proceed under the Employers' Liability Act until he had obtained the judgment of the arbitrator establishing direct personal liability. Was it the intention of the Government to continue that?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly.

Mr. PARKER SMITH was glad to hear it, because some hon. Members opposite did not appear to understand it. The great desire of employers was to get rid of litigation. There was nothing in the world that so irritated an employer as to have to pay enormous costs, knowing that the unfortunate man injured only got the merest trifle—[hear, hear!"]—through having got into the hands of low-class lawyers' agents, who thought more of their own interests than of the interests of the workman. Scotch employers had specially suffered in this way; and he knew that in all cases where there was no direct personal responsibility, they would much prefer to have some kind of fixed payment under arbitration.

Mr. T. SHAW (Hawick Burghs) understood the Committee to be unanimous that there should be a simple and economic method of ascertaining the rights of the parties. ["Hear, hear!"] Yet that was not exactly the point they were now discussing. The point was quite a different one, for it had reference to the undertaking given by the Colonial Secretary—an undertaking which he accepted in the frank and full sense in which it was given. He understood the Government now to have absolutely pledged themselves to what he apprehended to be the sense of the House, namely, that all rights of the workmen at common law or under the Employers' Liability Act should be preserved intact and entire, there only remaining open the question as to the form in which those rights should be protected. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman has not exactly quoted my words. What I said was that in cases of personal negligence every right the workman now enjoys will be preserved intact.

Mr. T. SHAW was glad he had interposed to make the point clear. He had the good fortune to have a copy of the Amendment, and its language was this:—

> "personal negligence or wilful act of the employer ('wilful act' might be deleted as superfluous) or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible."

He respectfully asked what that could mean except this—that all responsibility imposed by the Employers' Liability Act or by common law, which was responsibility not founded upon personal negligence merely, but upon what he might call secondary or deputed negligence, that all this was preserved for the benefit of the workman? Did he understand that the Government really meant to limit that existing right or not? He was not putting this in a controversial spirit, as, he was sure, the Colonial Secretary would recognise. It was only that the Committee might thoroughly understand the position in which it was put by the Amendment now brought forward by the Government. His intention and that of his Friends was that the Bill could not be allowed to pass into law unless they had an undertaking, absolute, specific, and clear, that it should not be cumbered by conditions limiting the existing rights enjoyed by the workmen of this country. ["Hear, hear!"]

SIR EDWARD CLARKE (Plymouth) thought the tone adopted by the last speaker—who had said that he and his Friends were determined the Bill should not pass into law except under some conditions he had laid down—was not calculated to assist the Committee in the discussion of a question as to which a difficulty was felt on both sides of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] He agreed with the hon. Member in his desire that the Bill should deal with the difficulty in the simplest of all forms. Looking upon the Bill as being a provision by way of insurance in a large number of trades, he should like to see all the remedies that workmen in any trade had had up to the present time left absolutely untouched. ["Hear, hear!"] That was not only the simplest, but the most satisfactory way. The idea of leaving the arbitrator to say whether a man was to have compensation under this Bill or was to go on with an action at law and pursue his remedy elsewhere seemed to him inadmissible altogether, while he should have the strongest possible objection to putting provisions in the Bill which would give the arbitrator the right of dealing with cases which were not in the Bill at all, but which really had to be determined elsewhere by the law that had been established with regard to employers' liability. He thought employers in the House had been led by the hon. and learned Member for Stroud into somewhat exaggerated apprehensions in regard to this matter. What was the real case? Suppose they left the old right to a workman in these trades of suing his employer if he chose under the Employers' Liability Act. That involved litigation, and litigation had been spoken of as if it were a terror to the employer. It was really more of a terror to the working men, and as such had operated in depriving them of the actual benefits which Parliament intended they should have under the Bill of 1880. But the position would be this. Suppose a workman was injured in the course of one of these employments and it occurred to him that the accident had happened through the negligence of the employer himself or of someone for whom he was responsible. It might be suggested to him that instead of going to the arbitrator and having the compensation assessed—which he might do without any question as to how the accident occurred—he might elect to bring an action against his employer, and, if successful, might obtain a larger sum than by the assessment of compensation under the Bill. For his part, he did not believe there would be one case in ten thousand where the workman would take that course and resort to litigation on the chance of getting a larger sum. When a man was injured in the course of employment the real question was how quickly he could get the compensation. The temptation to the workman to come under the Bill to the arbitrator and get promptly assessed a sum which might be as large as any sum he might get if he went to law and adopted a different procedure, would be so great that he did not think there would be one case in ten thousand where a man who had the right to the double remedy—either under the Employers' Liability Act by litigation, or under this Bill by arbitration—would resort to litigation. Under these circumstances would it not be simpler to leave the existing remedies absolutely untouched and unqualified, providing by the Bill there should be, with regard to certain specified trades, an insurance to which the workman could appeal for prompt satisfaction for the injury he had received, which should be sufficiently ample that the temptation to embark in litigation would be removed? ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) commented on the extreme inconvenience of the Committee being called upon to deal with a matter like this without having before them the exact words on the force and effect of which the whole question turned. As he comprehended the matter it amounted to this. If the arbitrator so decided, then a man should have two sets of rights or remedies; but if the arbitrator did not so decide, he was only to have one. He said it was not fair or reasonable to ask the Committee to put in the Bill these words which it did not know, on the understanding that it was to be enabled to do something with the words on the Report stage. The present was the proper stage for dealing with the words, and if the Government were not prepared with them, let them move to report progress, and ask leave to sit again and allow hon. Members to see the words. In the interests of order and of good legislation, he declared that the matter was one which entirely depended upon detail, and the detail depended entirely on the wording, so that it was unfair to ask hon. Members to introduce a clause which they could not apprehend, not having the words before them, on some sort of an understanding that some sort of thing was to be done or might be done upon the Report stage. The clause itself seemed little less than outrageous. The arbitrator was a man of limited capacity and knowledge, and the amount of compensation he could award was strictly limited by the Bill. The arbitrator might be not a very able man; he might be an uninstructed man, he might be a layman, he might be a prejudiced person, for instance, the candidate for the county. They strictly limited the powers he was to exercise under the Bill, but when they came to this clause they gave him power unlimited, because he was to say whether a workman should or should not be able to bring an action against his employer which would involve hundreds of thousands of pounds. To hand over to such a person a power which was absolutely illimitable, and ask the Committee to assent to it, on the understanding that some further action should be taken hereafter, was unreasonable.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) agreed that there was undoubted force in the complaint that it was impossible to properly discuss this Amendment without having the actual words before them. He ventured to suggest to the Ministers in charge of the Bill a course which might lead them out of their present difficulty. It was possible in the Report stage to re-commit a Bill with respect to any portion of it, and he would ask the Home Secretary whether he would give an undertaking now that if this Debate stopped at the present moment he would offer no resistance to a proposal to re-commit the Bill in such a way as would enable them to discuss this proposition with full freedom and with all the words before them.

*Mr. SYDNEY GEDGE (Walsall) pointed out that by the words of this clause with the Amendment, the workman could go to the arbitrator and ask him to decide first whether the accident was caused by the personal negligence of the employer or someone for whom he was responsible, and then when this was done the workman had all his original rights, and might go to the common law or to the Act of 1880 to obtain his remedies. But surely if the workman was to have these two sets of rights so ought the employer? They were told, however, by the Attorney General, that it would not be open to the employer to defend himself in an action brought by the workman under the common law or under the Act of 1880, and to show, contrary to the opinion of the arbitrator, that the accident was not caused by his personal negligence. That question was shut out and the matter limited entirely to the damages which the workman might go for in this tribunal. Just think how that would lead to litigation. As the law now stood an unscrupulous solicitor feared to bring an action lest, after attempting the difficult and expensive task of proving the employer's negligence he should fail to get a verdict, and lose his costs. But if, without his aid, the arbitrator found negligence, the solicitor would hurry the client into an action, knowing that the question being now one of damages only, he must win and get his costs out of the employer. The arbitrator's award should be like the finding of a true Bill by a Grand Jury, and not be conclusive. It would be better still to leave the whole question to the arbitrator, with power, if he found wilful negligence, to mulct the employer in double damages.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY rose merely to say that the Government had no "felonious intent" in bringing forward this Amendment. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] Last night they were in the presence of objections which they undertook to consider, and they now brought forward the Amendment in the clearest form they could devise. If the Committee would agree to insert the words the Government had no desire to curtail discussion at a later stage.

MR. ASQUITH reinforced the appeal of the Home Secretary. The Government had acted very fairly and properly, and for his part he regarded the right hon. Gentleman's assurance as satisfactory.

Amendment agreed to.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY moved in Paragraph (*b*), Sub-section (2) to omit the words "wilful and wrongful act or default," and to insert instead thereof the words "personal negligence or wilful act."

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he was going to try to do again what his right hon. Friend had just accomplished, and to give effect, in an Amendment not before the Committee, to what the Government believed were the wishes of the Committee. A very considerable time was spent the previous evening in discussing whether proceedings with regard to negligence should not be bilateral—whether, if they left the employer open to heavier burdens than the Bill imposed in cases of personal negligence, they ought not to take care that the workman guilty of negligence of a gross character, by which he had put in jeopardy the lives and limbs of his fellow-workmen, should not be debarred from obtaining compensation to which otherwise he would be entitled. He gathered that the feeling of the Committee was unanimous on two points. In the first place, it was unanimous in thinking that in such cases, however exceptional they might be, it would be an act of injustice and bad policy to give compensation; and he believed it was quite as strongly felt that nothing must be done which would in any way lead to an evasion of the Act by any employer, which would introduce a complicated doctrine such as the doctrine of contributory negligence, and thereby might prevent the workman from gaining just compensation. The Government, dealing with the Amendment then on the Paper, fancied they found a solution on the Paper in the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chester-le-Street, and the Government proposed that where a workman had wilfully and wrongfully brought about an accident by his wilful default or neglect of regulations which had been made by his employer he should not be entitled to compensation. Great objection was taken to that Amendment, and as the Debate went on it seemed to him that many objections were sustained. It seemed clear that it would probably raise questions of contributory negligence, and provide that the workman would not be entitled to compensation if he broke through a regulation which was altogether too wide. A regulation might be made with the direct intention and object of saving life. But, as a matter of fact, the regulations made were not of that character. They were comparatively trivial. At the same time a breach of them would destroy the workman's claim to compensation. That being the state of the case, and having gathered opinions from all quarters of the House, the Government now suggested an alternative Amendment, which was so short that even the Member for King's Lynn might be able to understand it—[*laughter*]—which was very simple, and to which, he believed, the objections of the hon. Members for Wansbeck and Durham and other hon. Members would not apply. In line 23 the Government proposed to insert the following new sub-section (*c*):—

> "If it is proved that the accident is solely attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of the workman himself any compensation claimed in respect of injuries to such workman shall be disallowed."

The sub-section, it would be seen, consisted of two parts. The first defined the act which would disable the workman; the second part only said that compensation should be disallowed. The important point was, what was the disabling act on the part of the workman? In the first place, it must be an act to which the accident was solely attributable. That got rid absolutely of any question of contributory negligence. In the second place, it must be attributable to serious and wilful misconduct. A trivial breach of rules would not be taken into account. The conditions he had stated could alone prevent a workman from being entitled to compensation. He did not think it was the desire of employers that if this Bill were passed there should be any possibility of evasion of its conditions by the less reputable class of employers. He was certain that that was not the intention or object of any employer in that House, and they would therefore sympathise with the Government in their endeavour, by the very stringent terms they had used, to prevent this clause being used as an instrument of evasion. He hoped the Government had met objections on both sides of the House and that this new Amendment might be accepted. He begged to move it.

On the return of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, after the usual interval,

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said there was no doubt that with the object of the words all members of the Committee would practically agree. They would also agree that if it was possible by the insertion of these words to deter wilful and wrongful acts, it would be desirable to do so; but he reminded the Colonial Secretary that accidents of this kind would be singularly few, and it was doubtful whether by the insertion of the words, good though they were, more harm would not be done than good. If, however, the words were to be inserted, he thought it ought to be made absolutely clear that the provision would only apply to the workman who himself had been guilty of a wilful act, and that in no circumstances could it be applied to any workman connected with the man who brought about the accident. The objection he had to the words was that they might lead to the setting up of a number of defences to litigation by some masters, especially in the case of single accidents where death occurred and there were no witnesses. The words might also lead to a defence being set up to an accident where a man was seriously injured and a long period of insensibility, with loss of memory, ensued, and there were no witnesses for the man seriously injured, or no witness of the act after the injured man had died.

MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens) was glad to find that the Government had so quickly fulfilled their pledge, and had inserted those words in order to meet the case of serious and wilful misconduct on the part of the workman himself. He was ready to accept the words which had received the approval of the Government. He cited the case of a workman being taken into a court of law to undergo trial for manslaughter, and at the same time claiming compensation under the Bill from the employer. In his judgment the words here inserted met the point contended for the previous day, and the Amendment was the least that could be inserted in order to meet the justice of the case.

MR. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) maintained that the words in the Amendment were no improvement on those of the previous day. What was the grade of misconduct that made it serious? His opinion was that irritation, friction, and serious injury before the arbitrator might arise in order to define the words "serious and wilful misconduct." He therefore opposed the Amendment on the ground that it was wider than the suggested alteration of the previous day. In taking up an attitude of opposition to the new words proposed, labour Members must not be understood as condoning or trying to mitigate any offence arising out of a man's wilful misconduct. ["Hear, hear!"] They had no such view. But how many such cases occurred in the whole industrial life of the country? That was a point which needed to be inquired into and answered. If employers of labour could show a long category of cases, serious in their character and number, where accidents had occurred owing to the man's wilful misconduct, he, for one, speaking for himself, would offer no demur whatever. All he desired was that no innocent man should be prevented from getting the benefits which this Bill gave him, and that nothing should be placed in the way of his getting his compensation speedily.

MR. G. W. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) said that, after all, it was the employers who would have to pay. He was rather surprised at the opposition which the clause had met with from hon. Gentlemen who represented the workman and labour in general. The cases under this clause would be very few, and although it might be a matter of expediency to include even such cases, still they involved such an absolute piece of injustice to the employer that he hoped the idea would not be carried into a legislative enactment. He could not see that the clause would open the door to any amount of litigation. He did not know much about the coal trade, but, speaking of the industry with which he was connected, he asserted that a serious accident, resulting in disablement for life or in death, happening without any one seeing it, was of the rarest possible occurrence. He fully approved the Amendment of the clause proposed, and he hoped the Government would be firm in passing it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, replying to questions put by the hon. Member for Battersea, said there was not the slightest fear that other workmen who were injured by the wilful misconduct of a fellow-workman would be debarred from claiming compensation. The words related entirely to a claim in respect of injury to the workman guilty of serious and wilful misconduct. The hon. Member for Durham appeared to have overlooked the fact that the onus of proof of misconduct would rest with the master. As to defining "serious" misconduct, he submitted that nothing would be more absurd and injurious than to attempt in this section to say what was serious and what was not. But what was meant was this—that the jury should have their attention directed to the consideration that it was not a mere technical breaking of a rule which should deprive a man of compensation, but that it should be serious misconduct in an important matter. The words, he reminded the Committee, were "solely attributable" to the wilful and serious misconduct, etc., which removed altogether the suggestion that contributory negligence could be brought up.

MR. FENWICK, referring to the remark of the hon. Member for Belfast about justice to the employer, said justice had been already cast to the winds by the promoters of this Bill. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] They were making the employer liable in compensation in cases where he was neither technically nor morally responsible for the accident caused. Therefore they might disabuse their minds of all considerations of justice. [*Ministerial laughter.*] He did not agree with the hon. Member for Battersea that the words were an improvement upon the Amendment under consideration yesterday. Would it be contended, if a workman failed to put in sufficient timber to prevent the roof from subsiding, and an accident ensued, that he had misconducted himself, and therefore contributed to his own injury? He feared that, in a case like that, it would be urged by the employer in defence, and perhaps held, that the workman, having contributed to his own accident, was not entitled to compensation under the Bill. The Government would be well advised not to introduce limiting words of this kind into the Bill. He agreed that the number of accidents which could be proved to be attributable to the misconduct of the workman would be very small, but the words would lead to much litigation and perhaps even to strikes. No working man's representative would defend on its merits the claim of a workman to receive compensation for injuries brought on by his own misconduct; but he opposed these words on the ground of expediency alone. He regretted that the Government had accepted the principle of the Amendment without waiting to hear what the labour representatives had to say. Only that day at a very large and representative conference of miners from all parts of Great Britain a Resolution was passed protesting against the acceptance of this Amendment.

MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) said that it was an extraordinary contention on the part of the hon. Member that the Committee should disabuse their minds of the principle of justice in this matter. But if this very reasonable Amendment were not accepted by the representatives of the working classes the Committee might indeed disabuse their minds of the principle of justice, for the Bill would be more one-sided than ever. It had been decided that the workman was to be placed in no worse position by any negligence of his employer, and the converse of that provision was only fair.

MR. R. B. HALDANE (Haddington) said that there were two considerations which must be weighed one against the other. As a general principle no one could deny that the workman ought to have no claim in respect of an accident brought about by his own misconduct. But, on the other hand, there was the fear that the defence which this Amendment would enable the employer to set up might lead to the frequent miscarriage of justice. The great majority of employers would wish to act fairly; but they would not always be their own masters. The insurance companies behind them would be bound to use every opportunity of setting up a defence to a claim; and what was easier than to suggest that an accident, the cause of which was not indisputable, resulted from the workman's misconduct? This was not a Bill to penalise the employer, but was a Bill under which the employer took upon himself the business of insuring the workman against injury. The common-sense way, therefore, was to proceed on the principles of the insurance companies, which found it most convenient to pay small claims for fires without inquiring too curiously into the cause of the fire. The balance of convenience under this Bill was that compensation should be as complete as possible in as many cases as possible. There were not many cases where accidents were caused by the wilful misconduct of the workman, and if to provide for such cases was to risk the denial of just claims it was better to keep the Bill as the Government originally intended it to be. The Government had acted generously on many points, but if they accepted the Amendment it would be a little like going back on the fundamental principle of the Bill.

*Sir E. CLARKE said that the principle of the hon. and learned Member was in favour of the Amendment. The Bill was to provide insurance against accidents. Where the accident was due to the neglect of the employer the Committee had withdrawn from him any protection against the larger liability. If a workman by his own serious default caused injury to himself, that injury could not be said to be an accident at all. It would be a distinct violation of equity to call upon the employer to compensate such an injury. The hon. Member for Wansbeck had complained that the representatives of the working men had not had an opportunity of expressing their views, and the speech of the hon. Member showed how little they would have contributed to the discussion if they had had the opportunity. [*Laughter.*] It was idle to suppose that litigation would be increased by the Amendment. No question could be raised until the man came before the arbitrator and claimed compensation, when it might be pointed out that it was entirely his own doing, and not an accident at all. The Government had arrived at a form of words which seemed to be as perfect an expression of the general opinion of the House as could be devised, and he therefore hoped they would stand by it.

Mr. THOMAS BURT (Morpeth) thought that the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth had done an injustice unintentionally to his hon. Friends. Their complaint was not that they had no opportunity of speaking, for as a matter of fact they did speak, but that his right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary on Monday night accepted an Amendment before they, the representaives of workmen, had expressed their views upon it. TheAmendment now before the House was in his opinion just. [*Ministerial cheers.*] But his right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary, in a speech on Monday night, with the terseness and precision of which he was a master, put the case admirably in a few sentences; and the right hon. Gentleman himself recognised that, while justice was on one side, it might be in the interest of both employer and workmen to act on the principle of expediency. His hon. Friend the Member for Mid Durham had described it as worse than the Amendment of yesterday. He did not think it was. He thought the Government had taken great pains, indeed, to guard against opening the door too wide. But his objection was against opening the door at all, and leaving it ajar, because it would be pushed forward —["hear, hear!"]—and considering that one of the advantages of the Bill was the avoidance of litigation, he believed that both employers and workmen would in the end be benefited by not accepting the principle of the Amendment. Therefore he should certainly vote against the Amendment if a Division were taken.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said he had just a word to say in reply to the admirable speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth, which exhibited all those characteristics of fair-mindedness and generosity that had made his hon. Friend one of the most popular Members of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] His hon. Friend complained that on a previous occasion he had hastily accepted an Amendment without having heard the opinions of representatives of working-class constituencies on the subject. He pleaded guilty. The real fact was that he was not then aware of the strong objections which those hon. Gentlemen took to the proposal; and he rose to accept the Amendment in the hope of shortening the Debate. He could only apologise and express his regret for the mistake, for which the Government and himself had already suffered. [*Laughter.*] With reference to the Amendment, he thought that justice required that some such provision should be inserted in the Bill. The Government had guarded it by saying that the accident must be solely attributable to the workman, and must also be due to serious and wilful misconduct. Under these circumstances it was evident that the objections to the Amendment and the fears which it had aroused were so improbable of realisation, that he could not help thinking that his hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth, who was at all times and in all circumstances an advocate of justice, would admit that the Government were entitled to ask for the support of the House.

*MR. MARK OLDROYD (Dewsbury) felt that the insertion of those words would lead to the very unsatisfactory working of the Measure; and in the interest of the broad and equitable settlement of the question of compensation for accidents he was anxious that the best characteristics of the Bill should be preserved in their integrity. By far the largest number of accidents in textile factories were due to the cleaning of dangerous machinery when in motion. This was forbidden by the Factory Acts and by all masters, managers, and foremen, but it was done every hour of the day in hundreds of factories. It was certain that, in the case of an accident arising in these circumstances, the insurance company would put forward the plea that the accident was due to "serious and wilful misconduct," inasmuch as it arose out of a breach of the factory laws by which employers as well as workmen were bound. It had been argued that these cases of serious and wilful misconduct would be few in number, but as far as the textile trades were concerned he submitted they would not be few in number. A large proportion of the accidents in those trades arose from the action of the workmen who were thus contravening the Factory Acts. He thought also that it was scarcely in accordance with the facts to say that cases where evidence would not be procurable would be very few. In the textile industries a great deal of work was done by workmen when standing between the different machines where no one could see them, and many accidents happened to workmen when they were not in view of their fellow workmen. This was not a question which would affect colliery owners in the case of disasters in which a large number of men were injured, as the colliery owner in such cases would still be responsible. This Amendment would only relieve them from responsibility in the case of the one man by whom the accident was caused. But if the Amendment was adopted, injustice would be perpetrated in a great many cases, because it would be impossible to prevent the raising of the defence that serious and wilful misconduct had taken place. Very often the energetic, persevering, and strenuous workman would be the victim of his own enterprise, and would fail to recover the compensation which the less enterprising workman would secure. Although the Government had shown every disposition to secure what was called abstract justice, yet if the Amendment were adopted it would be liable to very great abuses which would far more than counterbalance any occasional justice which would be done. He hoped, therefore, the Government would not adhere to the Amendment.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he quite understood the importance of the discussion in which they were engaged, but the matter had been discussed at considerable length, and he thought it must be felt on both sides that the Committee was ripe for a decision. ["Hear, hear!"]

Sir F. MAPPIN (York, W.R., Hallamshire) trusted that the Committee would reject the Amendment. The hon. Member, who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the Amendment would not be satisfactory not only in regard to railway companies but in regard to other large employers of labour in the country.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233; Noes, 123.—(Division List—No. 218—appended.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold, Alfred
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Barry, A. H. Smith- (Hunts.)
Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Barton, Dunbar Plunket
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol)
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolitho, Thomas Bedford
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Bucknill, Thomas Townsend
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Chaloner, Captain R. G. W.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clarke, Sir Edw. (Plymouth)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne (Beds.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T.D.
Cox, Robert
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Rt. Hn. G. N. (Lanc. S. W
Curzon, Viscount (Bucks.)
Dalbiac, Major Philip Hugh
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Drage, Geoffrey
Drucker, A.
Duncombe, Hn. Hubert V.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir R. U. Penrose
Flannery, Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Folkestone, Viscount
Forster, Henry William
Forwood, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur B.
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fowler, Matthew (Durham)
Fry, Lewis
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt. Hn. G. J. (St. G'rg's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Captain
Gunter, Colonel
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas, Seale-
Heath, James
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down)
Hill, Sir Edw. Stock (Bristol)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hobhouse, Henry
Holland, Hon. Lionel Raleigh
Hopkinson, Alfred
Hornby, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutchinson, Capt. G.W. Grice-
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jenkin, Sir John Jones
Johnson-Ferguson, Jabez Edw.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Johnstone, John H. (Sussex)
Joicey, Sir James
Kenny, William
Kenrick, William
Kenyon, James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverp'l.)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Lecky, William Edward H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leighton, Stanley
Lloyd-George, David
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A.R. (Essex)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Liverpool)
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lubbock, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Maclure, John William
McIver, Sir Lewis
McKillop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robert Jasper
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)
Morrell, George Herbert

Mount, William George
Murray, RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Arthur (Darlington)
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Pender, James
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Plunkett, Hon. Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Edward
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richardson, Thomas
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Russell, Gen. F.S. Cheltenham)
Russell, Sir George (Berksh.)
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel (Herts)
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Henry M. (Lambeth)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strachey, Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sutherland, Sir Thomas
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Ure, Alexander
Waring, Col. Thomas
Warkworth, Lord
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webster, Sir R. E. (Isle of Wight)
Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, John Lloyd
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.)
William, Joseph Powell- (Birm.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Edmond R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Acland, Rt. Hon. A. H. Dyke
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John (Yorkshire)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. J. Blair (Clackm)
Barlow, John Emmott
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bethell, Commander
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Sir Chas. (Glasgow)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.)
Colville, John
Commins, Andrew
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crombie, John William
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Daly, James
Dalziel, James Henry
Davitt, Michael
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Dunn, Sir William
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Ellis, Thos. Edw. (Merionethsh.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton)
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gourley, Sir Edwd. Temperley
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Harrison, Charles
Harwood, George
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Holburn, J. G.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land)
Leng, Sir John
Lockwood, Sir Frank (York)
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
McArthur, William
McEwan, William
M'Hugh, E. (Armagh, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
McKenna, Reginald
McLeod, John
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Mundella, Rt. Hn. Anthony John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Kelly, James
Oldroyd, Mark
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pinkerton, John
Priestley, Briggs (Yorks.)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, Hn. James (East Kerry)
Roche, John (East Galway)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Souttar, Robinson
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tully, Jasper
Wallace, Robert (Edinburgh)
Wallace, Robert (Perth)
Walton, John Lawson
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Wayman, Thomas
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Fredk. W. (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodall, William
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Hudrsfld.)
Woods, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Mr. Fenwick and Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda).

*MR. RENSHAW (Renfrew, W.) wished to move an Amendment, in order to put the question whether the arbitrator was to have power, when the facts were brought before him, to decide whether the workman claiming was to go to a court of law to obtain his remedy, and whether, if the workman lost his case in the court, he was to be still entitled to go again to the arbitrator. Hon. Members had expressed a desire to prevent litigation as far as possible, but it seemed to him that unless this point was made clear, an employer of labour might be called upon to defend two actions where it might be possible to have only one.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said the query of his hon. Friend was a very natural one. The first question was whether the arbitrator was to have power to decide that there was such a state of circumstances that a man could have a greater remedy than the compensation under the Bill. As matters now stood a workman had the right to go either before the arbitrator or to the Court. It might possibly be necessary to insert some words to prevent the cost of a double litigation. His impression was that the proceedings taken must be final and conclusive for all parties, but he would take care there was no possibility of double proceedings being taken.

MR. J. L. WALTON (Leeds, S.) said he would be glad to know the view of the Attorney General with regard to a position which, it seemed to him, must necessarily be created under the operation of the first words of the clause. As he read the clause, a court of law was debarred from deciding whether the Act did or did not apply to an action which was brought before it. An engineer employed by a colliery company and receiving £1,000 or £1,500, might be injured, and might seek compensation on a larger scale than that provided by the Bill. He would possibly be advised he had an action at common law. He might take action and go through all the usual ramifications of pleading. When the case came before a Judge and jury the Judge might find there was a question whether the Act applied or not. The costly proceedings would be avoided, and the plaintiff forced back to the arbitrator to have the preliminary question determined. He would suggest that words should be struck out so that any competent Court should be entitled to decide whether or not the Act did or did not apply to the case brought under its notice.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked what were the words the hon. and learned Gentleman suggested should be struck out?

MR. WALTON: "If any question arises whether employment is one to which this Act applies."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Those words have been struck out.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY moved in Sub-section (3) to leave out the words "wilful or wrongful act or default" and to insert "personal negligence or wilful act," explaining that the Amendment was consequential upon what had been previously decided by the Committee.

Amendment agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL proposed another consequential Amendment, namely, to insert in Sub-section (3) after the words "injured," the following words:—

"or whether the accident was solely attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of the workman in respect of whose injuries compensation is claimed."

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. RENSHAW moved after the words last added, to insert the words,

"or whether loss or damage has resulted to the dependants from the death of the workman."

He desired to have it made clear that the arbitrator was to consider when he was arriving at his award whether or not the dependants were entitled to claim. In the first schedule the expression "dependants" was defined as—

> "such members of the workmen's family as are entitled to damages in cases under the Fatal Accidents Act 1846";

and under that Act, which, by the way, did not apply to Scotland, grandfather, grandmother, father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, and stepchildren were regarded as dependants. What he thought ought to be made clear was that compensation ought only to be given to those who had really and truly suffered loss or damage. Supposing a father was killed, it ought not to be in the power of the arbitrator to award damages to a son who was in full employment, and who was not really dependant upon his father. While at the present moment good employers did not grudge showing every consideration to those dependants who were really dependant upon an individual who met his death in the course of his employment, he thought there ought not to be, through the operation of this Bill, a suggestion that compensation was to be paid to individuals who really and truly suffered no loss or damage. The question was one of importance, and he thought it would reassure employers if they were perfectly certain that the arbitrator would have the whole question in his discretion.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said no doubt it would have to be considered, when they came to the definition of dependants in the Schedule, whether the words "must have suffered pecuniary damage" must be the limit. He would suggest that it would be better that the discussion should be taken on paragraph 3 of the Schedule.

*MR. RENSHAW said it seemed to him that in this part of the Bill there was the power of giving to the arbitrator a discretion in this matter. If they waited until they came to the Schedule it seemed to him they would possibly be met with the argument that they had given the arbitrator no power to deal with the matter.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said that could not be. Paragraph (3) of the Schedule said that any question as to who was a dependant or as to the amount payable to each dependant should be settled by the arbitrator. Therefore they had only got to define "dependants" in the paragraph previous to prevent any question arising out of it.

*MR. J. B. BALFOUR (Clackmannan and Kinross) said that there was a difference in the law of England and the law of Scotland in regard to the persons who had a right of action against an employer in respect of the death of a workman, and that if any definition was put in here it should be without prejudice to the existing rules of Scotch law on that subject.

*MR. RENSHAW said it seemed to him that the third sub-section of the schedule failed in doing what he suggested.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he did not say that the schedule did it now. He was only suggesting that that was the proper place to raise the question whether or not it should be done.

MR. HOPKINSON said it appeared to him that his hon. Friend was right in his contention. They were enumerating here the issues which the arbitrator had got to determine, and it appeared to him better to enumerate them all here.

*MR. J. B. BALFOUR said he understood that the provision as to arbitration was not to arm the arbitrator with the power to determine the legal question who should fall under the class, but rather the question of fact whether certain particular persons did fall under the class, which should be defined by the law.

MR. SETON-KARR asked whether it would be competent for them to introduce into the third clause of the schedule the point, not whether certain persons were or were not dependants, but whether such persons had suffered loss.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL rose to point out that not only could that course be taken but that it was the right place to take it. The proper way was, when they came to discuss the meaning of the third paragraph of the schedule, to move an Amendment that dependants should mean such members of a workman's family as had sustained pecuniary damage. There was no doubt that then that question could be properly raised. It was very inconvenient to prejudge in this section the question whether or not the arbitrator should have power to decide whether loss or damage had resulted to dependants before they determined whether that should be the governing condition or who were to be dependants under the Bill.

SIR ROBERT REID pointed out that if his words were included now it would not make it obligatory upon the arbitrator to require proof of loss or damage in the least. All it would do would be to add another to the number of questions which were enumerated as being appropriate for consideration by the arbitrator. In his judgment none of these questions were in the least degree necessary. It would be sufficient to say that all questions arising as to liability or amount under this Act should be referred to the arbitrator.

MR. GRANT LAWSON (York, N.R., Thirsk) said the question raised by his hon. Friend's Amendment was just one of the questions which the Bill as it stood did refer to the arbitrator. One of the questions was as to the amount of compensation under this Act, and the amount of the compensation under the Act would depend upon the amount of damage suffered.

MR. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) said that if he understood the Amendment aright it would restrict the operation of the Bill very much, because, where a man was killed except the dependants showed that they had suffered pecuniary loss by his death, the sum held out in the schedule—this death legacy of £150 or £300 or any sum between—would not be paid.

*MR. RENSHAW said the hon. Member was quite right in his interpretation of the Amendment, but in view of what had fallen from the Attorney General, who, he understood, would bring forward words dealing with this question when they reached that portion of the schedule, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he was not aware that he had given such a promise. What he intended to say was that, if it was the opinion of the Committee that the compensation to dependants should be paid only to those dependants who could show that they had sustained pecuniary damage, then at the proper time it would be necessary to deal with that opinion in the second schedule. He did not pledge himself or the Government on the matter.

MR. ASQUITH hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would not pledge himself either.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouth, N.) moved in Sub-section (3) after the word "agreement" to insert the words "and any question as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies shall."

MR. WALTON said he opposed the insertion of these words for the reasons he had already given. The question whether the Act applied or not was an initial question which was outside the scope of the questions connected with the Bill, and that question, he submitted, was one which any legal tribunal ought to be entitled to decide when the matter was judicially brought into the Court.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL thought there was a point here which required to be dealt with, and it was only fair to say that his attention was called to it by his hon. Friend the Member for Oldham. But he did not think the remedy which the hon. Member suggested was the right one. He thought it was quite clear when he assented a little while ago to the Amendment, that these words must come in, for this reason, that they could not exclude this question from the jurisdiction of the arbitrator. It was quite clear that there might be cases in which it would be necessary for the arbitrator to decide it. What he could assure the hon. Member was this. Possibly a question might arise in an action at law brought by a man who was mistaken as to his rights. There were two courses which might be adopted, and he was bound to say he did not think it unreasonable that when a man elected going to law under such circumstances, the penalty should fall on himself. But there was another course that would not be so hard; that was to say, if an exceptional case arose of an action being improperly brought, the Court should have power to decide the question as though it had been an arbitration under the Act. He would consider the point, if the hon. Member would allow him, between this and a later stage of the Bill, especially as the remedy suggested by the hon. Member for Oldham was that if a mistake should be made any Court should have power to deal with that exceptional case. He thought it was quite plain that these words must be re-inserted, but they must consider what was to happen if and where a mistake arose as to the form of litigation.

Sir ROBERT REID said that he was not going to press the Attorney General to deal with this matter finally at present, after his appeal for time to consider it. But he could not conceive the necessity for inserting the words, because they had already stated not only a large number of questions to be left to the arbitrator, but he was also to decide whether there was any liability to compensation under this Act. Now, supposing the arbitrator had before him this fact, that the employment was not an employment within the scope of the Act, how on earth could he refrain from deciding that there was no liability under the Act? But supposing the question arose in another case, for example in the High Court, was it really intended that litigation arising in the High Court or the County Court, under the Employers' Liability Act should be interrupted, and there should be a remission of this matter to the arbitrator? Replying to an observation of the Attorney General which was not audible in the Gallery, Sir R. Reid said he would not occupy the time of the Committee further, but he must say that when a Bill—without making use of any observation of an unduly critical character—was presented in this form, it was not unreasonable to comment upon it, and he hoped the Attorney General would not resent suggestions provoked by the character of the Bill.

Mr. CRIPPS urged that the door must not be opened to the workman to take a wrong course of procedure, in order to get compensation in another way than was contemplated by the general principle of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) moved to insert, as a new sub-section, the words:—

"(4.) Proceedings for the recovery under this Act of compensation for an injury shall not be maintainable unless notice that injury has been sustained is given within six weeks and an arbitration is commenced within sx months from the occurrence of the accident causing the injury, or in case of death within twelve months from the time of death. Provided always that in case of death the want of such notice shall be no bar to the maintenance of such proceedings if the arbitrator shall be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse for such want of notice. The notice shall be served in the manner provided by the Employers' Liability Act 1880, section seven."

In moving this Amendment, he wished once again to express what he expressed on the First and Second Reading of the Bill, namely, his sincere desire to assist in passing the Measure. He cordially approved the principle of the Bill. But he had also said that it certainly required some important alterations. He trusted the Government would recognise that employers like himself—and there were many in the House—had no desire to withstand the principle of the Bill, but they wished to make it a workable and a harmonious Bill. It was workmen who were to call the tune, but it was the employers who would have to pay the piper. Well, they wished to have the tune somewhat soft, harmonious, and pleasing. They wished to avoid friction. [*A laugh.*] Well, that had been the great argument, that they were not to have more litigation, or that the litigation was to be reduced to the minimum. He hoped that was their intention, and it was their (the employers) desire to assist them in realising it. He had framed his Amendment with that object, and he thought it would be admitted on both sides of the House that it was an Amendment which did justice to both employers and employed. Speaking on behalf of a mining constituency, from which he had been returned largely by the votes of the mining employés, they all thought that the Amendment was required. The Bill fixed no term for giving notice of claim or action, and it was a great and a serious omission. The Employers' Liability Act required notice, and he did not think any hon. Member could resist the contention that some notice at all events should be given, and he thought the term set out in his Amendment was a reasonable one. He trusted, from the remarks which fell from the Attorney General last night, that the Government would favourably consider his Amendment.

Mr. URE hoped the Government would not consent to the Amendment just proposed. If there was one serious defect in the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 it was the requirement that notice of claim should be given. It had been found in the great majority of cases—and he was speaking from long experience—to be quite useless. No accident could occur without its being known to everyone concerned, and to require notice of the accident was hopelessly futile. On the other hand, no time limit ought to be raised in the way of a workman making a claim or bringing his action. Depend upon it, self-interest would in every instance induce the workmen to take steps at the earliest possible moment and no inconvenience had ever been felt in securing that sufficient evidence on both sides should be available. The notice clauses, in the experience of those closely acquainted with the working of the Act of 1880, had proved a great injustice to workmen, and had resulted in no corresponding advantage to the employer.

MR. W. J. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) supported the Amendment. There was no argument against it in what the hon. Member who had just sat down had said. Surely, if no accident occurred without its being known, there could be no hardship in asking that the employer should have notice.

MR. URE: My contention was that the requirement of notice was futile.

MR. GALLOWAY: Surely, if the hon. Member suggests that notice is futile, it cannot work hardship on the workman. He will forgive me if I cannot see it in the same light as he does.

MR. URE said his contention was that notice was futile because it was unnecessary.

MR. GALLOWAY: If notice is unnecessary, surely I am not wrong in contending that there can be no hardship in its being given. They were putting on the employer a responsibility which some of them thought very heavy and grievous indeed; and surely they had a right to ask that they should know at some time in their lives when their responsibility for a particular accident would cease. It was a small pittance they were asking, when they asked that they should at least know the extent of their liability. If he thought his Amendment would work any hardship to the workman, or prevent for one moment any just claim being substantiated, he would not submit the Amendment. They were told that justice and equity were not to be found in the Bill; but surely, even on the ground of expediency, which seemed to be the great argument used in favour of the Bill, they might well ask that the employer should be protected in this small way.

MR. ASQUITH observed that they spent a considerable time in discussing this matter the previous day, when he understood the Government to say they intended at some later stage to introduce some provision to the effect that the delivery of a notice of the accident within a prescribed time should not be made a condition precedent to a claim for compensation. That being so, he could not see any justification for again going over a matter which had already been discussed and as to which he understood the Government had come to a final decision.

MR. LEES KNOWLES said he thought the proposal with regard to the notice a reasonable one. As this appeared to be a Bill chiefly affecting mining industries, he would like to call attention to a rule which appeared in the book of rules of an accident relief society connected with his own district, and which was worked mainly by the working men themselves:—

> "Rule 20. Reporting Injury. Any workman on being hurt must report the injury to the head banksman and also to the steward as soon as possible and before leaving the premises, or bring sufficient evidence from the colliery of his injury."

Surely if such a rule was considered reasonable by the workmen, the Committee might also adopt that view. The main object of requiring notice of the accident to be given was that evidence might immediately be collected of the way in which the accident was caused, whereas if a long time was allowed to elapse before notice was given all traces of the cause of the accident might long ago have been swept away.

Mr. J. M. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland) opposed the Amendment. There were, he said, a great many cases in which the operation of such a clause as this would be injurious to the workmen. Take the case of a fall of the roof in a mine. A workman might have received some spinal injury, but not have given notice of it at the time, thinking that by continuing at his work he might work off the effects of the accident, the full force of which would not develop till long afterwards. If men were compelled to give notice of an accident within a specified time they would feel bound, in order to safeguard themselves, to give notice at once, even in those cases where they had received an even slighter injury than they at first imagined, and which they would soon have worked off. The matter was a small and trifling one, and he hoped the Committee would not spend further time over it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN could not agree with the hon. Member that this was a small matter, nor yet was it unimportant. On the contrary, he regarded it as one well worthy of consideration and although at the present moment there appeared to be a considerable difference between the two sides of the House, he hoped that in the course of the discussion they might arrive at some common agreement in reference to it. He thought his right hon. Friend opposite somewhat misunderstood the position of the Government, because he seemed to have assumed, from something that was said when this matter was under discussion, that the Government had expressed themselves as opposed to requiring any notice either of the accident or of the claim, and that, therefore, they might be expected to be hostile to the principle of the Amendment. [Mr. Asquith: "As a condition precedent!"] That was not the position taken by the Government. As to the notice of claim, they undertook to give further consideration to the matter and see if they could not meet what appeared to be a reasonable demand; and as regarded the question of notice of the accident, to which they attached less importance, they said they would consider it at the same time, and they might possibly find some means of dealing with that also. He considered, therefore, that as far as the Government were concerned, they were entitled to say they still had an open mind on the subject, and were not pledged against the consideration of an Amendment which, he thought it must be admitted, was at the first sight, at any rate, extremely plausible. He would go so far as to say he should consider it to be more than that, if it were not for the fact that they had behind them the experience of the Employers' Liability Act, in which almost precisely the same words occurred, and where, undoubtedly, the clause had not been found to work altogether satisfactorily. ["Hear, hear!"] It had led to a great deal of irritation and litigation, and he doubted very much whether the employers or the workmen would express themselves as satisfied with the results of this clause, so far as their experience of the Employers' Liability Act had gone. On the other hand, surely the object of everybody should be to see that the persons who enjoyed the benefits of this Act should be deserving of them, and it was as much the interest of the workmen that the benefits of an Act of this kind should not go to malingerers or persons putting forward fraudulent claims as it could be of any Member of that House. ["Hear, hear!"] Undoubtedly, if notice of the accident was indefinitely delayed, and, above all, the claim was indefinitely delayed, there was much more room for a fraudulent claim than there would be if it was possible to give notice of the claim immediately. That, he believed, was admitted. On the other hand, it must be equally admitted that there were cases in which notice could not very easily be given, and where a claim could not be made for a considerable time afterwards. Take the case of a fall of a roof in a mine, in which a man was injured, but in which evil consequences were not developed until long afterwards, either in connection with the spine or brain. These were, therefore, cases in which the claim could not be made at the moment of the accident. There was no reason, however, in the case suggested, why notice should not be given of the accident, and all the information concerning it might be in possession both of the person who might subsequently have to claim compensation and the person who might have to resist such a claim. All he should ask for would be notice of the accident, and if that were given that would be sufficient as regarded the question of notice. The question whether injury had been sustained would arise when the claim was advanced. With regard to the claim, the Amendment proposed that that need not be commenced within six months from the occurrence of the accident in the case of injury, or in the case of death within 12 months.

MR. ASQUITH was understood to say that his objection was not merely to the notice of injury, but to the notice of accident, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman had agreed that it was not necessary for the protection of the employer that notice of the accident should be given. When it was necessary, no doubt the claim should be made within a reasonable period.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN had admitted that in the opinion of the Government the question of the notice of the accident was a matter of less importance, because in the great majority of cases the knowledge of the accident would come to the employer or his representative at the same time. Although he did not think it was of the same importance as notice of the claim, yet on the other hand he did not think there could be much objection in requiring, with proper safeguards, that notice of the accident should be given, especially when, as in this Amendment, they provided that the arbitrator might relieve the claimant of the condition if he found there was a reasonable excuse.

MR. ASQUITH: That is in the case of death.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN begged the Committee not to consider that he was asking for any more than the principle of the Amendment. He agreed that if they accepted the Amendment, it would require to be further amended, and one Amendment should be that the proviso should apply to all cases of injury, and should not be confined, as it was in the Employers' Liability Act and in this Amendment, to cases of death. There might be many cases of accident which did not result in death, but in which claims might be *bonâ fide* delayed for a considerable period; and, if the arbitrator was satisfied that there had been reasonable cause in that case as well as in cases of death, he should be allowed to take notice of it. The Government might accept the principle of the Amendment, but he suggested that his hon. Friend should abandon reference to notice of injury or accident and confine himself to notice of claim, the Amendment to read:—

> "Proceedings for the recovery under this Act of compensation for injury shall not be maintainable unless the claim is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident causing the injury, provided always that in every case want of such notice shall be no bar to subsequent proceedings if the arbitrator shall be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse."

If this alteration were consented to, the Amendment would be worthy of acceptance by the House.

MR. J. WILSON (Durham) considered the Amendment unnecessary, as notice would be given of every accident, and a claim made a long time before the six months expired. Accidents often seemed trivial at first, but subsequently developed serious complications which incapacitated a man for life. Because an accident seemed trivial, and a man, therefore, did not give notice of action for compensation, was he to lose his right of action?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said the proposal he had made would not be open to the hon. Member's objection. He would read how the Amendment would stand if his own suggestions were accepted:—

> "Proceedings for the recovery under this Act of compensation for an injury shall not be maintainable unless notice of the claim is given within six months from the occurrence of the accident causing the injury, or, in case of death, within twelve months of the time of

death, provided always that the want of such notice shall be no bar to the maintenance of such proceedings if the arbitrator be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse for want of notice."

If an accident to a workman had been trivial, no notice of it need be given. He would have to make his claim within six months, and in a case apparently trivial at first, he would do so if the effects of the accident made themselves known before the expiry of six months. If a longer period elapsed before notice, he would be able to argue that he had had reasonable excuse.

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON (Preston) suggested that there should be a direction in the Bill that notice of the accident should be given, but that the Bill should not state specifically what would be the consequences of not giving notice. The arbitrator might be left to inquire whether notice had been given, and, if it had not, he might draw his own inferences.

Sir R. REID said there were many statutes under which notice of action was required to be given, but it was a bad policy to require notice of action, and he was opposed to it in principle. Notice of claim was here made a condition precedent, and if it was not given, the workman's right to compensation might be set aside if the arbitrator thought there was not reasonable excuse. The true test was whether the employer had been prejudiced in his defence by the absence of notice. If the arbitrator thought he had not been, was it fair to allow a technical point to prevail against the claim of the workman. He suggested that a provision in the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 (which afforded a precedent) should be adopted, and that the words should be:—

> "Provided always that the want of such notice shall not be any bar to the maintenance of such proceedings, unless the arbitrator considers the employer is prejudiced in his defence by the absence of such notice, and the omission to give such notice was with the intention of misleading."

Sir J. JOICEY was very much surprised that there should be any strong objection to the just demand on the part of the employer for notice of an accident. He failed to see that any case could arise in which it would not be prejudicial to the employer if notice were not given. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not want to prejudice the workman in any degree in regard to his claim, but the employers wanted some notice by means of which they could verify the accident. He was really surprised that any fair-minded man could object to a reasonable notice. It was most unjust and unreasonable that no notice should be given, and he was sure that if he were to appeal to any body of workmen in the country there would be a sufficient number of fair-minded men among them to agree to giving the employer fair notice. Every benefit society and every insurance company required a notice of this sort. Why, then, should such a reasonable demand on the part of the employers be refused? ["Hear, hear!"]

*Mr. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) said that the notice under the Employers' Liability Act was unsatisfactory in its form and required lawyers to construe it. The time within which it had to be given was at present six weeks. That length of time was considered by the workmen far too short, and within the last few weeks he had had the opportunity of handing to the Secretary for the Colonies a resolution passed by the representatives of 200,000 operatives in favour of an extension of time for notice from three to six months. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he might alter his proposed Amendment by providing for notice within six months, action within 12 months, and, in the case of death, action within 12 months of the date of death. He thought that would get rid of a very difficult position.

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) denied that any man on his side of the House desired to prejudice the workman in any way. In all their friendly society rules provision was made for notice, and if it did not prejudice them in connection with friendly societies, why should it prejudice them in this case? ["Hear, hear!"] He would make an offer on behalf of the employers, and that was that whatever was the best notice of accident under any friendly society's rules, they would be content with. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said he hoped a decision would be come to before half-past five.

Mr. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) said he was quite willing to withdraw his Amendment so far as it was necessary to give effect to the intention of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I move to leave out from the word "notice" down to "commence," in the third line, in order to insert after the word "notice" the words "of the claim is given."

*Mr. RENSHAW said he wished to point out that one of the great difficulties with regard to this question of notice, from the employer's point of view, was, not that the employers wished to have notice in order to prevent the workman substantiating his claim, but to be perfectly certain that the injury was met with in the employment of a particular employer. If no notice whatever was to be given, a workman, who had been off work for a time sufficient to entitle him to get compensation, might go to other employment, and, meeting with an injury in it, might make a claim on his previous employer. He submitted that some words ought to be inserted to the effect that notice should be given that the injury had been sustained before the workman entered such second employment. The words the right hon. Gentleman proposed might then be inserted.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) hoped that this question would not be rushed through. ["Hear, hear!"] There were a number of propositions before the House, all of which required consideration, and, as it was within a few minutes of half-past five, he suggested that the Government might now report Progress, in order to give time for consideration. ["Hear, hear!"]

Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again"—[*Mr. Chamberlain*]—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES].

Committee thereupon deferred till To-morrow.

BENEFICES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 29th June.

BENEFICES (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

COTTON CLOTH AND OTHER FACTORIES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

PRISON-MADE GOODS (IMPORTATION) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

ALIENS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday 30th June.

WORKING MEN'S DWELLINGS BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

MILITIA BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 29th June.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNTY COUNCIL CLERKS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

GROUND GAME ACT (EXTENSION TO COPYHOLDERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

CEMETERIES RATING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

COMMONS REGULATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

POLICE PENSIONS AND SERVICE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SMALLER DWELLINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 3rd June.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Friday.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Friday.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Monday next.

LABOUR BUREAUX BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

PARISH REGISTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

MONEY LENDING.

Ordered, That Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. A. K. Loyd be added to the Select Committee on Money Lending.—(*Sir William Walrond.*)

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. J. G. BUTCHER (York) asked for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and explained that the object of his Measure was to abolish the doctrine of common employment.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Butcher, Sir Edward Clarke, Sir William Houldsworth, and Mr. Ascroft; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 270.]

House Adjourned at Twenty Minutes before Six o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 27th May 1897.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

RAILWAY CLEARING HOUSE BILL [H.L.].

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON (Preston) moved:—

> "That it be an Instruction of the Committee that they insert provisions requiring the promoters to publish for the use of traders, on such terms and conditions as the Board of Trade may direct, any sectional or other railway maps constructed for the Railway Clearing House, indicating the different lines of railway and the distances along the same."

He said he did not think that it would be desirable for him upon that occasion to go at any length into the history of the Railway Clearing House. It was originally formed as a voluntary association in 1842. It performed the necessary work of breaking up traffic which went over more than one line of railway and apportioned the proceeds arising from it among the various companies interested. The Railway Clearing House formed one of the links that bound the great railway companies together for their united advantage. It was inevitable that as time went on the great railway companies would be fused into one body, and he had no objection to offer to the Railway Clearing House upon that ground. For some years past Airey's railway maps, showing in miles and chains the distance between the different stations and junctions on the railways of Great Britain, published by Mr. John Airey of the Railway Clearing House and certified by the railway companies, had been in general use by traders and had been procurable by them through the booksellers. In 1896 complaints were made by the traders that they could not obtain these maps, and in answer to a question asked by the hon. Member for Denbigh Burghs, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, said:—

> "I am informed that Mr. Airey, clerk in the Railway Clearing House, has been allowed to compile, publish, and sell various maps relating to the railways of the United Kingdom, that in 1894 it was considered by the Committee of the Clearing House undesirable that such business should be carried on by a clerk without control, and the Committee therefore, by mutual arrangement, took over from Mr. Airey his plant and paid him a considerable sum for the loss of his business, which is now the property of the Clearing House. I am also informed that the Committee do not propose in the future to publish for public use any maps beyond those of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. If this decision of the Committee is adhered to, I shall regret the loss of information which is of decided advantage to the public, for although the distances between stations are continually subject to variation, by the alteration of a junction or the opening of new routes, stations, or junctions, and although distance tables are prepared by all companies in compliance with their obligations, the advantage to the public of such practical and intelligible maps as have hitherto been published by Mr. Airey must be considerable. I have no control, however, over the decision of the Clearing House Committee."

The withdrawal of the maps, which were the only ones of the kind obtainable by the public, and which had been of the greatest possible assistance to traders, rendered it impossible for them to ascertain, in the case of through traffic, which had to pass over more than one line of railway, whether the railway companies concerned were or were not exceeding their powers of charging, and also made it impossible, without having reference to the companies' rate books, to ascertain the real distances between any two stations or places. The railway companies did not set out the distance travelled over the system of each company, which might be a party to a through route, and the rate-books frequently omitted even the total distance from the place where the book was kept to the point of destination on another company's line. In July, 1896, he himself had asked a question on the subject in that House to which the President of the Board of Trade had replied as follows:—

> "I am in communication with the Railway Association with reference to this matter, and it is engaging their attention at the present time. The Statute (*i.e.* the section of the Regulation of Railways Act 1873, which requires the railway companies to keep for public inspection at each of their stations a book showing *inter alia* the distance from that station to any place to which any rate is charged), to which my hon. friend refers imposes a penalty for a contravention of Section 14, and it is, of course, open to any person aggrieved to institute proceedings. I cannot compel the companies to do more in the way of publication of distances than the law demands. The distance tables referred to are compiled by the companies for their own use, but they are, no doubt, valuable in assisting the companies to compute the distances for insertion in their rate books."

In January last, in reply to a further question asked by him the President of the Board of Trade gave the following answer:—

> "I regret that the correspondence with the Railways Companies' Association has not led to any satisfactory result. The association hold that the question of the publication of these maps is one for the consideration of the Committee of the Railway Clearing House. I cannot hold out any hopes that the Government will undertake the preparation of such maps."

The maps had been provided by the Railway Clearing House, and had been drawn up from information supplied by the railway companies, who now sought to minimise the value of them. Although under the Act of 1894 every railway company was under an obligation to give information as to its distances and rates, it was not bound to give the distances which goods had to be carried over other lines. These maps supplied the traders, in a convenient and ready form, with the information they desired on the subject, and, moreover, enabled them to select the best route for their traffic. This question did not come upon the railway companies as a new one, and, although they had not seen their way to concede this extremely reasonable request, he hoped that, now that the opportunity presented itself, the companies would reconsider their decision. Personally he had no desire to act in any hostile way towards the railway companies, because he believed that their interests and those of the traders were identical. He did not see what the companies could gain by pursuing a policy of mystery and concealment in the matter. He begged to move the Instruction which stood in his name. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northampton, E.), in seconding the Motion, said that it appeared to him that the Railway Clearing House could hardly be considered merely as a railway companies' institution. It partook in some degree of the character of a national institution, and had to deal with interests other than those of the railway companies. The course taken by the companies in suppressing these maps was wholly inconsistent with the recent policy of railway legislation. When the Act of 1894, was passed, an Amendment was expressly inserted to require the companies to keep for inspection all the rate books of 1892, which would enable traders to prove their case and check new demands. The withdrawal of these maps was impolitic, and would provoke further action as to railway charges. ["Hear!"]

MR. J. W. MACLURE (Lancashire, Stretford) said that this Bill had been promoted by the committee of the Railway Clearing House merely for the purpose of enabling them to carry on their own business more conveniently, and the Measure had nothing whatever to do with the public. In these circumstances he regarded the Instruction as irrelevant to the objects of the Bill. Every railway company might refuse to give the information upon which the maps were based, and, therefore, it would be absurd for a Select Committee of that House to require the Railway Clearing House to furnish these maps when they had no power to compel the railway companies to give them the necessary information for preparing them. Moreover, the maps were frequently most misleading, owing to the changes that were daily taking place through the construction of new lines and new junctions. He hoped that the House would not accept the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman. ["Hear, hear!"]

SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle), while of opinion that railway companies ought not to withhold any necessary information from traders, desired to point out to the hon. and learned Member for Preston that this Bill had nothing whatever to do with railway rates. It was simply a Measure for the incorporation of the Railway Clearing House. He agreed with the hon. Member who had just sat down that these maps were most misleading. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon) said that, while he was in entire sympathy with the hon. and learned Gentleman who had moved the Instruction, he thought that the House ought not to call upon the Railway Clearing House to do that which was impossible for them to perform. ["Hear, hear!"] There was nothing in the Instruction which would enable the Railway Clearing House to call upon the railway companies to furnish them with the necessary information for drawing up these maps. The only result of this Instruction being carried would be that the promoters would withdraw the Bill, which had been introduced for the wise and proper object of providing for the incorporation of the Railway Clearing House. It was all very well for the hon. Gentleman to say that this information was of no real service to the traders, and that it might be of a misleading character. Perhaps the traders might be allowed to judge. ["Hear, hear!"] The railway companies had formed their opinion, as they had a right to, but the traders had formed an entirely different view. They thought that the information would be of a valuable character, and that it might guide them in their operations and put some kind of check on the charges of the railway companies. He thought they might dismiss the argument that the information was not of a character that would be valuable to the trading community. Believing, as the Board of Trade did, that this information was of value, they had made more than one effort to induce the companies to publish it, but he regretted to say that up to now the information had not been given. He hoped that the companies would very seriously consider the speech of his hon. Friend and the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite, which he had no doubt could be supported from all parts of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] He thought if the companies did not give the information, they would be doing themselves a great disservice. The interest of the railway companies was to render all the assistance they could to trade. In doing that they were serving their own interests. Under all the circumstances, he hoped his hon. Friend would not persist in pressing this Instruction. It was an Instruction which could not possibly be worked. He thought time ought to be given to the companies to reconsider the matter between now and the Third Reading. If the railway companies still declined, his hon. Friend could take such action as he thought proper on the Third Reading of the Bill.

*MR. MELLOR (York, W.R., Sowerby) was afraid that if the hon. Gentleman gave way to this suggestion, he might lose his hold upon the Bill and the machinery to carry out what he desired to promote. There was hardly a Member of the House who had not had a letter from his constituents on this matter. He believed that throughout the country there was a widespread belief that these maps were very valuable. It was urged that the maps might be misleading, but surely the traders could judge for themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] When the railway companies came to that House to ask for Parliamentary powers, that House might well say, "You are placing yourselves in a very different position from what you were in, and, while we grant you these powers, you must do something for the public in return." ["Hear, hear!"] What was the reason why the companies would not give them these maps and this information? Strong pressure had been put on the companies to give it. At one time the information had been given. Then it was said these maps were incorrect. But if the people thought they could get information out of them they should have them. What was the real grievance? The railway companies were advised that if the maps were published, the Assessment Committees would get them as well as the traders, and that the position as to rating would be altered. He did not believe that a company got any benefit from refusing information such as this. The best plan was to be open with the public, the traders, and the Assessment Committees. It was said that if this Instruction were carried there was no machinery to compel the companies to give this information, but if the Instruction were carried, the machinery would soon be provided.

MR. CHARLES MURDOCH (Reading) said he thought it was a new departure to pass any such Instruction with regard to a private Bill. The railway companies would gladly give any information that might be required. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and* an HON. MEMBER: "They don't!"] They were now asking the House to do that with regard to the railway companies which they would not do with regard to other associations. They would not attempt it, for instance, with regard to the banking companies, and he objected to a penal clause being inserted in these Bills. It was hard that documents which were copyright should be, under compulsion, given to the public.

MR. JAMES BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) was glad to observe that the hon. Member who had just sat down had not adopted an attitude of absolute hostility. He understood him to say that the railway companies would not be unwilling to do what they could. Under these circumstances, the House would be unwilling to force on an Instruction which might involve the loss of the Bill. The President of the Board of Trade had suggested that the matter might stand over until the Third Reading, and with that view he begged to move the adjournment of the Debate. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. TOMLINSON said that the course suggested by the right hon. Gentleman would be entirely satisfactory to him. He did not desire to press hardly upon the railway companies, but was quite willing to give them time to consider in what form they could give the information.

Mr. R. W. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) trusted the hon. Member for Preston would carry the Instruction to a Division, so that there might be some security that the Railway Clearing House would, in consideration of the large powers they sought, perform that duty to the trading community which they ought to have performed long ago.

Mr. SPEAKER said that the hon. Gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of the adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in the event of an amicable arrangement not being arrived at, he would, on the Third Reading, support an Instruction such as that they had been discussing?

Mr. RITCHIE did not think it was right he should be asked to give such an undertaking, or that it was right he should give it. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not desire that the railway companies should consider this question under any threat at all. He had expressed the opinion of the Board of Trade in terms which could not be misunderstood, and thought he had said quite sufficient.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE said that he would endeavour, with his hon. Friend the Member for Reading (Mr. Murdoch), to bring the subject fairly before the Railway Association, of which he was a member. His own view was that if the trader wanted this information, he was perfectly welcome to it. It could only be given, however, by the united railway companies publishing an authentic map, such as was described by the hon. Gentleman who seconded the Instruction.

Debate adjourned till Monday 28th June.

SUCCESSION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Tomorrow till Wednesday 30th June.

QUESTIONS.

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY (SCOTLAND).

Sir THOMAS SUTHERLAND (Greenock): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that inhabited house duty is now, for the first time since the passing of the Lunacy (Scotland) Act of 1857, being imposed on the parochial asylum at Smithston, which is under the management of the Greenock Parish Council; and will he explain the reason of this action of the revenue officials, which is opposed to the usual practice of the Government, in exempting from inhabited house duty asylums which are occupied by paupers and maintained by a parish rate?

*The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Graham Murray, Buteshire): I understand that an appeal against this assessment was heard before the District Commissioners of Taxes on April 29, and that the Commissioners decided that the case was governed by the decision of the Court of Session in the case of Musgrave *v.* Dundee Royal Lunatic Asylum. They therefore confirmed the assessment, and, as the Parish Council have not demanded a case for the opinion of the Court, the decision of the Commissioners must stand until another opportunity occurs of reviewing it.

POSTAL FACILITIES (CO. CAVAN).

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a petition was sent in December last from the inhabitants of the townlands of Coravaddy, Carnabosh, Libru, Mullaghboy, Tullygally, Rathkenny, and Drumrene, in the County of Cavan, requesting the establishment of a post office at the house of Mr. Brown, Rathkenny; whether he is aware that the nearest money or postal order office to Rathkenny is Coothill, which is four miles away; and whether he will take steps to carry out the wishes of the petitioners in this case?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): The Postmaster General received the petition referred to. The nearest post office to Rathkenny where money order and postal order business can be transacted is apparently Lisnageer, which is about 3½ miles distant. The inquiry made on receipt of the petition showed that the number of letters for the district was insufficient to justify the establishment of a post office at Rathkenny, but the question of extending the free delivery of letters in the locality is about to be taken up, and the hon. Member shall be informed of the result.

NATIONAL SCHOOL MONITORS (IRELAND).

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say if monitors in National Schools are paid as much salary as monitors in Model Schools; and, if not, can he state the reason?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Monitors in ordinary National Schools are paid according to the same scale of salary as those in Model Schools.

TUSKAR LIGHT.

MR. GEOFFREY DRAGE (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the great importance attached by the shipping trade to the prompt reporting of vessels which pass the Tuskar Light and Signal, he can see his way to make temporary arrangements with the Post Office under which permission can be given for the use of the existing telephone for signalling purposes?

MR. RITCHIE: Until the general question of the desirability of allowing lighthouses to be used for the purposes of commercial signalling has been decided, I do not think that I should be justified in sanctioning the use of the telephone at any particular lighthouse for such purpose.

DISCHARGE OF BRITISH SEAMEN ABROAD.

SIR GEORGE BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Discharge of British Seamen abroad has yet been sent in, and whether it will be presented to Parliament; whether the scheme for the transmission of seamen's wages experimentally tried at Dunkerque, has already been extended to four other Continental ports; and whether the present excessive charges on seamen's money orders can be abolished, seeing that the fees for discharges of seamen more than cover the cost of extra office work entailed on the Consulates by the new system?

MR. RITCHIE: I have not yet received the Report to which my hon. Friend refers, but I understand that it will be sent in shortly, and it shall in due course be presented to Parliament. The transmission scheme for seamen's wages, experimentally tried at Dunkerque, has been extended to three other Continental ports—viz., to Antwerp, Hamburg, and Rotterdam. The question whether it is desirable to abolish the fee charged for sending home seamen's wages is receiving consideration.

EQUIVALENT GRANT (SCOTLAND).

SIR LEWIS McIVER (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that the principle of Equivalent Grants has apparently been abandoned in respect of Ireland, he is in a position to state what annual sum will in future be allocated to Scotland in correspondence with the relief of rates recently announced for Ireland?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It is at least premature to assume that the principle of Equivalent Grants has been abandoned, because it is proposed to accompany a great reform in Irish local government with a much larger relief from rates than Ireland would have been entitled to on the basis of Equivalent Grants. But if that principle had been abandoned, it would follow that the necessities of Scottish agricultural ratepayers would have to be considered rather than any question of corresponding amount in grants, and these necessities were met to the extent of five-eighths of the occupiers' rate of the Act of last Session. In any case, no question can arise during the current financial year.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether cyder, perry, and British wines, containing up to 15 per cent. of alcohol, can be manufactured and sold without duty being paid on them; whether any statistics exist of the quantity of these beverages manufactured; and whether they are chiefly made in England; and if so, whether any compensating immunity from duty can be granted to the native stimulants produced in Ireland and Scotland?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: There is no duty on the manufacture of the liquors mentioned by the hon. Member, but a licence duty has to be paid on the sale of them by retail. There are no recent statistics as to the production of them; but it was found, after an exhaustive enquiry which was made in 1887, that about one-sixth of the whole annual production of British wines came from Ireland, and it was estimated that about the same amount came from Scotland.

MR. LOUGH said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the question as to the percentage of alcohol. Was it a fact that alcohol up to 15 per cent. was free of duty?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I cannot answer that, but I should not think it is. These liquors contain very varying amounts of alcohol; some very little indeed.

BALLINAMORE CANAL.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state the names and addresses of the Trustees of the Ballinamore Canal; whether there is any public office in which they meet or where they can be seen; and, can he state in what form they can be approached, *i.e.* whether by private letter or by memorial presented through a legal channel?

MR. HANBURY: The canal is under two bodies of trustees, one for navigation and one for drainage purposes. I assume that the hon. member refers to the navigation trustees, who are appointed as vacancies occur, by the Grand Juries of the adjoining counties. The Roscommon Grand Jury have refused to appoint any trustees at all, but the Grand Juries of Cavan, Fermanagh, and Leitrim have appointed representatives, and I have here a list of their names and addresses which I shall be happy to give to the hon. Member. I am not aware whether they have any office, but the secretary to the trustees is Mr. B. St. George Harrison, Carrick-on-Shannon, and I suppose he can be approached by private letter.

ARMY SERVICE RECORD (JOSEPH DENISTON).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he can explain why Joseph Deniston, formerly of the 10th Foot, who recently applied for a copy of his record of service to the War Office, was not supplied with the record along with such other copies of discharge as are granted to soldiers leaving the service?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, W.): It would be contrary to the Queen's regulations to issue to discharged soldiers duplicates or copies of their discharge documents.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any further statement to make concerning the repeated applications of William M'Donnell, of Caldragh, in the union of Longford, to have a cottage erected for him under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous question of the 5th February on this subject, except to say that, so far as the Local Government Board are aware, the Guardians do not at present propose to make a new scheme for the erection of additional cottages in the Union.

CYCLES (CARRIAGE BY RAIL).

MR. JAMES BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will communicate with the leading railway companies on the subject of the carriage by rail of bicycles, with the view of inducing them to convey bicycles at lower rates than the present very high rates, to provide upon some trains vans or compartments of vans fitted for the conveyance of bicycles, and to supply at the left luggage offices of the large stations a better provision than now exists for the reception and safe keeping of cycles?

MR. RITCHIE: I shall be happy to communicate the points referred to in the right hon. Member's Question to the Railway Companies' Association, and ask that they may receive favourable consideration.

LONGFORD UNION WORKHOUSE.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been drawn to the strong protests of the medical officers of the Longford Union against the practice of having the sick poor conveyed to the workhouse hospital in the antiquated van at present in use: and whether, as within the last few months verdicts have been returned by two coroners' juries in two inquests that the deaths were directly attributable to the patients having been forced into this van, and the Board of Guardians have persistently refused to provide a suitable van, the Local Government Board intend to take any action in the matter?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The attention of the Local Government Board has been drawn to the unsuitability of the ambulances referred to, and they have frequently urged the Guardians to provide suitable conveyances. In the case of two recent inquests, the coroner's jury found that death was accelerated by removal to the Workhouse Infirmary in the existing ambulances. The Guardians, on the 15th inst., authorised the Medical Officers to employ a carriage or other suitable conveyance when they considered it advisable, and with a view to determine if this order will meet with the necessities of the case, the Local Government Board have instructed their Inspector to ascertain whether suitable vehicles are available for this purpose.

ANTIQUITIES (IRELAND).

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Donegal (Mr. J. G. SWIFT MACNEILL), I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (1) whether he is aware that the Council of the Royal Society of Antiquaries, Ireland, offered to the Science and Art Department some Irish antiquities which had formed part of a small museum belonging to the Society located in the city of Kilkenny, and that the Director of the Science and Art Museum, Dublin, wrote in reply that the acceptance of the offer must be postponed for a short time, awaiting the appointment of a superintendent of Irish antiquities in the Dublin Museum; (2) whether he will explain why on the 10th of the same month an official letter from the Science and Art Department, South Kensington, informed Alderman Murphy, of Kilkenny, that they had no intention of accepting the collection; and (3) whether communication to this effect has been made to the Royal Society of Antiquaries, Ireland; if not, what reason can be given for this treatment of a proposal apparently approved of a week before by the Committee of Council on Education.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The offer mentioned in paragraph 1 was made, and was still under consideration of the Science and Art Department, when they received a memorial, largely signed, from the secretary of the Kilkenny museum, protesting very strongly against the proposal. Under these circumstances the Department declined the offer; but, through an oversight their decision was not officially communicated to the Royal Society of Antiquaries.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (LONDON).

CAPTAIN DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for South Donegal, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the report of the proceedings in Scotland Yard on the 14th May, when Sir Edward Bradford, the Commissioner of Police, received a deputation from the Humanitarian League to lay before him a resolution passed at a public meeting in St. Martin's Town Hall, on the 5th May, urging that the London Police should be instructed to act more promptly and on their own initiative when they witness any ill-usage of horses by flogging or overloading in the streets, and to the remark of the Commissioner of Police with reference to the contrast drawn between the action of the Metropolitan and City Police in cases of ill-usage of horses, that the City Police are able to act more vigorously because they have a much smaller area to control, and convictions may be more easily obtained before Aldermen of City Courts; and, whether he will take any steps to assimilate the practice of the Metropolitan to that of the City police in checking cruelty to animals in the streets?

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I have communicated with the Commissioner, and he informs me that he had what he thought was a private conversation with three gentlemen representing this league; but that he cannot accept the report alluded to in the Question as an accurate account of what passed, and that he certainly did not intend to convey that the practice of the City Police in the matter differs from that of the Metropolitan Police. I am fully confident that the Commissioner will do everything in his power to further the humane objects which the league has at heart.

CAPTAIN DONELAN asked whether it was not the duty of the police to see that gravel was used on the streets in slippery weather?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY was not aware that such was the duty of the police; he imagined it was the duty of those who had charge of the roads.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Diamond Jubilee Day in Scotland, so far as the Post Office is concerned, will be celebrated on the same lines as in England, and the duties confined to one delivery and one dispatch of letters?

Captain Donelan.

MR. HANBURY: Yes, Sir; as far as possible.

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in commemoration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, now approaching, he would consider the propriety of advising the release of the treason-felony prisoners now still in prison?

MR. W. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he is aware that at many public meetings recently held in Ireland resolutions were unanimously passed asking for the immediate and unconditional amnesty of the Irish treason-felony prisoners now confined in English and Irish gaols; and whether, in view of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, the request of the Irish people will be granted?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I am afraid that I can add nothing in answer to this Question, or the Question of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's Division of Dublin, to what has been already stated in this House both by the Leader of the House and by myself.

MR FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman take the Question into his consideration before the Jubilee?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Sir, I am always considering this question. [*Laughter.*]

MR. FLAVIN: I mean with a view to a favourable answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, seeing the amount of extra duty and responsibility which will be cast upon the Metropolitan Police Force during several days at the time of the Jubilee festivities, he will consider the advisability of giving to each member of the force a substantial gratuity in addition to an extension of the customary annual leave?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I have nothing to add to the answer which was given last week—namely, that it was hardly necessary to remind me as to this, and that at present any statement would be premature.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, following the precedent established in 1868–69 with reference to Waterloo and Peninsula veterans, he will consider the advisability of marking this Jubilee year by granting a small pension to veterans who have served through the two most important campaigns of the present reign, namely the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: Special campaign pensions have, under certain conditions, been awarded to men who took part in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns. It is not at present contemplated to go further in that direction.

MARYBOROUGH GAOL (PRISONER THOMAS COLLINS).

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will again take into consideration the petition in favour of the release of Thomas Collins, a Kerry prisoner, at present confined in the invalid prison at Maryborough; and whether, owing to the seriously injured condition of the prisoner's mind, his release will be granted?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The case of this convict was considered, on memorial, so recently as last month, and the Lords Justices, who had before them a special medical report on the mental and physical condition of the prisoner, decided that there were no grounds for a remission of sentence. It is not correct to say that the mental state of the prisoner is seriously impaired.

IRISH FISHERIES.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the report of C. H. Smith, divisional officer at Ballyheigue, County Kerry, in which he states that immense shoals of herring, mackerel, and other fish appear in Ballyheigue Bay; and whether, with a view of developing the fishing industry, a suitable pier will be erected, as recommended by the divisional officer?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The construction of a boatslip at Ballyheigue was at one time under the consideration of the Congested Districts Board, but the project was abandoned. I will call the attention of the Board to this Question, but of course I cannot express an opinion as to whether their funds could be advantageously expended on this particular work.

Mr. FIELD asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that steam trawlers were accidentally captured and seized for trawling within the prescribed limits, and that an inquiry had recently been held by the Irish Fishery Commissioners, whether it was intended to place a gunboat on that coast to protect the line fishermen and smaller trawlers respectively?

[The hon. Member explained that the words "Galway Bay" had been omitted from the Question.]

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: This question presumably refers to Galway Bay, where some steam trawlers were captured about a year ago. The Inspectors are not aware of any recent violation of the law by trawlers in these waters.

POLICE FORCE (COUNTY KERRY).

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Kerry is the heaviest taxed county in the United Kingdom, and that white gloves were presented on several occasions lately to the County Court Judge owing to the absence of crime; and whether, as the county is in a peaceable condition, a further reduction will be made in the extra police force so as to give immediate relief to the ratepayers?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware whether Kerry is the heaviest taxed county in the United Kingdom, though I believe it is a fact that the county cess is higher there than in any other county in Ireland. The poor rates are levied by unions, and it would take some time to compare the incidence of these rates with the poor rates in other counties. Arrangements have been made consequent upon the continued improvement in the state of Kerry, to reduce the extra force of police stationed in the county to seven men, and it is hoped that after a short time these also can be dispensed with.

Mr. FLAVIN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the First Lord of the Treasury had stated that Kerry was the heaviest taxed county in Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must not make it a practice to comment on the answers he receives.

Mr. FLAVIN: It is because he denies facts. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. D. KILBRIDE (Galway, N.) asked whether it was a fact that in the barony of Corkaguinny the taxes were 13s. 6d. in the pound, and that in the barony of Ivereagh——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice should be given of a detailed Question.

PORTUMNA RAILWAY.

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he can state who is the owner of the derelict Portumna Railway; (2) what are the financial responsibilities attached thereto; and (3) whether the Government intend to aid in having the line put into working order?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: In answer to the first paragraph, the Board of Works are mortgagees in possession of this line of railway. The second paragraph is obscure and I cannot answer it. As regards the third paragraph, I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous similar inquiry of the 29th March last.

Mr. KILBRIDE asked if the right hon. Gentleman could say what became of the metal and iron of the permanent way of this railway—who removed it?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I believe a good portion of it was stolen. [*Loud laughter.*]

SCHOOL ATTENDANCES (IRELAND).

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government intend to bring in a Measure to amend the law so that compulsory attendance of children at school can be enforced in Ireland?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to my replies to the Questions addressed to me by the hon. Member on this subject on the 11th February and 2nd April last.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AUDITORS (IRELAND).

Mr. J. H. PARNELL (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) what were the salaries of the Local Government Board auditors previous to the additional duties thrown upon them in auditing corporation, town commissioners, etc., accounts; (2) whether the auditors get all the fees imposed for audit on these bodies in the first year for this additional duty, and what did it amount to; (3) did the Treasury increase the auditors' salaries; and, if so, how much; and do they receive the several sums fixed upon for the audits of corporation, etc., accounts, and how much does it amount to; (4) whether, if the fees of the Treasury exceed the increase made in the salaries, he will consider the advisability of reducing the amount paid by corporation town commissioners or of paying for these audits out of the Imperial Treasury; and (5) whether he can say in what manner are the audits of corporation, town commissioners, etc., paid in England, Scotland, and Wales?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The salaries of auditors before the additional duties referred to in the first paragraph were imposed upon them were £600 annually. The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. The cost of audit of the accounts in question was originally calculated at £1,516. 13s. 4d., which is still the amount charged to the local authorities, although the number of towns and the expense of auditing their accounts have since largely increased. The salaries of the auditors were increased to £700 in December 1872, and the contribution of £1,516. 13s. 4d. by local authorities is repaid to the Treasury under Section 6 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1872. I see no reason to believe that the local authorities are overcharged in respect of the work done for them. I have no information regarding the last paragraph of the Question.

LIGHTHOUSES (RED SEA).

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the increased shipping from India and Australia, the Government will take steps to have an adequate number of lighthouses stationed on the shores of the Red Sea?

Mr. RITCHIE: As stated in my reply to the hon. Member for the South Division of Bristol, a circular has been addressed by Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to the representatives of the Great Powers inviting their co-operation on the subject of additional lights in the Red Sea. No steps can be taken by Her Majesty's Government until the replies to these communications have been received and considered.

CAVALRY RECRUITING STANDARD.

General RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, as regards the recent regulations, which make it impossible for any man between the heights of 5 ft. 9 in. and 5 ft. 11 in. to enlist in the British Cavalry, efforts will be made to prevent desirable recruits of this height who are disinclined to enlist in the Infantry or Artillery being lost to Her Majesty's Service?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The hon. and gallant Member may rest assured that the recruiting authorities will not omit an effort to induce such recruits to enter some branch of the service for which they are eligible.

KING'S LYNN PILOT COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. J. A. WILLOX (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will explain on what grounds the King's Lynn Pilot Commissioners, having refused to grant a pilotage certificate to the foreign captain of a foreign ship occasionally visiting King's Lynn, the Board of Trade superseded the local Commissioners and appointed special examiners to grant a pilotage certificate to the said alien; and whether this power was exercised by the Board of Trade under Section 600 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894?

Mr. RITCHIE: The King's Lynn Pilotage Commissioners refused to grant a certificate to Captain Ferange to pilot his own vessel on the ground that his vessel was a foreign vessel, commanded by a foreign master, notwithstanding the fact that the pilotage sections of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, apply both to British and foreign ships. An application having been made by the Belgian Vice Consul at King's Lynn to the Board of Trade to appoint a person to examine Captain Ferange under Section 600 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, this was done, and, the examiners having reported that he was competent, the certificate was granted.

PORT NESS HARBOUR (LEWIS).

Mr. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state who prepared the original plans, specifications, and quantities for Port Ness Harbour, and the amount of the original estimate; whether any departure has been made from the original plans; and, if so, will he describe what departures have been made, and the additional cost incurred in consequence of the changes?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: The details asked for are not such as can well be given in the form of an answer to a question, but if the hon. Member will address a communication to the Scottish Office on the subject, the Secretary for Scotland will be prepared to give him a reply.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, having regard to the fact that no work it at present being done at Port Ness Harbour, he will state whether it is the intention of the Government to have the work proceeded with; and, if so, when?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: Yes, Sir. It is intended to employ to the best advantage the unspent balance of the grant for this work; but it is necessary first to come to an understanding with the trustees, and the Scottish Office is now in correspondence with them.

FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND).

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state whether any tenders were received in response to the specification, dated 20th March 1897, and issued by the Fishery Board for Scotland, for a new fishery cruiser which was to be delivered to the Board on or before the 1st July 1897; and, if so, will he state the names of the firms who tendered?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I am unable at present to give the names of the firms who tendered, because, so far as I am aware, the matter referred to is still under negotiation.

ARTILLERY PRACTICE (PLYMOUTH SOUND).

MR. F. B. MILDMAY (Devon, Totnes): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has received any recent complaints on behalf of fishermen, of dangerous firing in the vicinity of Plymouth Sound; and whether he will give such instructions as will prevent its recurrence?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): Nothing is known at the Admiralty on the subject. My hon. Friend has given me some details with reference to the alleged dangerous firing near Plymouth Sound, and I have referred his communication to the Commander-in-Chief at Plymouth, in order that an inquiry may be made into the matter.

NEWINGTON VESTRY ELECTION.

MR. JAMES BAILEY (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that Mr. Levi Joseph Dunham, returning officer at the vestry election on Saturday next, 29th May 1897, for the parish of Newington, has written a letter to *The South London Press* of Saturday last, 22nd May 1897, in which he makes a long attack in a partisan spirit on the election address of one section of the candidates, and concludes by calling upon the ratepayers to vote for the opposite party; and whether, considering that this returning officer has thus declared his partiality to one section of the candidates, the Local Government Board will take steps to prevent his presiding at the coming election?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): My attention has been called to the letter of Mr. Levi Joseph Dunham, the returning officer at the vestry elections for the parish of Newington on Saturday next, which was published in *The South London Press* of Saturday the 22nd inst., but only since a notice appeared of the Question of my hon. Friend, and I have thought it my duty to call for an explanation, which I have received. It affords, in my judgment, no excuse for conduct on the part of the returning officer which appears to me to have been grossly irregular and most reprehensible. It would be too late now to take action to prevent his presiding, the elections being on Saturday next, but I have no doubt that care will be taken by the candidates to guard against any irregularity on the part of the returning officer. Under the statute a returning officer who is guilty of any wilful misfeasance is liable, in addition to any other penalty or liability to which he may be subject, to forfeit a penal sum not exceeding £100 to any person aggrieved.

READING PRISON (DISCHARGE OF WARDER).

MR. DAVITT (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department (1) whether the circumstances which induced him to dismiss a warder recently from Reading Prison included the giving of some bread to a youthful prisoner who was found crying from hunger in his cell; (2) what other circumstances, if any, led to such dismissal; and whether, in case the giving of the food in the manner mentioned was the only breach of discipline committed by the warder, he will reconsider the penalty inflicted on the erring officer; and (3) whether the offence for which an ex-prisoner has been sentenced to 14 days' imprisonment for throwing some cigar ends among convicts at Borstall is in itself legally punishable by imprisonment; and, if not, what were the other grounds on which this punishment was inflicted by the magistrates who tried and sentenced the prisoner?

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: The answer to the first paragraph is in the negative. As regards the second, I think it would be very undesirable to enter in detail into the circumstances attending the dismissal of prison officers. I have already informed the hon. Member that the account which he appears to have received is an incorrect one, and that I am perfectly satisfied that the dismissal of this warder was a proper step. The answer to the third paragraph is in the affirmative. The statute under which the prisoner was convicted was 2 and 3 Vict. cap. 56, Section 22, and his sentence of imprisonment was in default of payment of a fine.

BROADMOOR CRIMINAL LUNATIC ASYLUM (ISABELLA HEWSON).

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department (1) whether application has been made to him to consider the case of Isabella Hewson, committed to the York Assizes in May 1885 on a charge of manslaughter, who, having at a time when her mind was unbalanced taken the life of her illegitimate child, was ordered, in consequence of the medical evidence, to be detained during Her Majesty's pleasure, and has been in custody 12 years, and is now detained at Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum; (2) will he explain why the prisoner is still detained, in view of his reply on 6th April to an application made by her sister for her release, in which he declined to authorise her discharge, and stated that it should be understood that her continued detention in the asylum is not for the purpose of punishing her for a crime committed when she was not responsible; and (3) whether he has ordered, or is prepared to order, a special inquiry into her mental condition, with the object of ascertaining whether she can be discharged and committed to the care of her relatives?

*Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Yes; I received such an application last March, and being satisfied, after a careful inquiry into the case, that the woman could not safely be discharged, directed the answer to be sent to which the hon. Member alludes in the second paragpraph of his Question. I have made fresh inquiry since the hon. Member gave notice of his Question, and regret that her condition remain unchanged, and that discharge is impossible at present.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he would call upon the Government of India to make a Report as to the effectiveness of the steps taken by the Indian Government in 1894 to prevent the supersession of officers of the Indian Staff Corps by those in the line by granting temporary rank to commandants and seconds in command in native regiments?

*The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing): The question of the supersession of officers of the Indian Staff Corps by those in the line is now under my consideration in connection with a letter recently received from the Government of India.

CHARGE OF LARCENY (CO. TYRONE).

Mr. DALY: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he will order the immediate release of two men named Maguire, County Tyrone, who are at present in prison on a charge of larceny from William Triston, considering that in July 1896, when charging the jury before whom the Maguires were tried, Judge Andrews remarked that if money found upon the accused could have been identified as upon the deceased on the night in question, no one could fail to see the importance of such evidence, but that they had not the materials upon which they could come to such a conclusion; and what is the reason for the detention of the Maguires in prison on the charge of larceny after substantial bail being offered for their appearance when called upon?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. J. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.): I have already, in answer to several questions from hon. Members stated to the House that the brothers Maguire are at present in prison on the charge of robbery from the person of one, Triston, deceased, and that it is intended to put them on their trial at the next Summer Assizes for that offence. From the only report of Judge Andrews' charge which has been furnished to me, the learned Judge does not appear to have made the statements attributed to him in the question. The application to be admitted to bail was made to the learned Judge who presided at the case, and refused by him, as appears from the report, on the ground that they were apprehended when they were fleeing from justice.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say how many questions he had answered on this subject, and whether, in the interests of justice, he would decline to answer any further questions?

Mr. DALY: May I ask whether it is because the Maguires are Catholics that they are kept in prison?

Mr. J. DILLON (Mayo, E.) asked whether it was intended by the Crown to proceed on the charge of robbery before the death, or only on the charge of larceny?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: Both.

MERSEY DOCKS BILL.

Mr. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Mersey Docks Bill, which is to be read a Third time on Thursday, will seriously interfere with the shipment of cattle from Ireland to Liverpool; and whether he will take steps to prevent injury to one of the remaining industries of Ireland?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I know of nothing in this case which would justify the Irish Government in taking the very unusual course of opposing an English private Bill.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, as this Bill was postponed for nearly a month, he would take the trouble to inform himself of the opinion of the shipowners and those interested in the cattle trade of Ireland; and whether, if he found that the Bill would be detrimental to both, he would use his influence to prevent the passing of the Bill?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot undertake to take action on such inquiry, and it has been ruled already, I believe, that the shipowners have no *locus standi* in the matter.

GLEBE ACT (IRELAND).

Mr. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he would favourably consider the extending the time of repayment of loan to clergymen in Ireland under the Glebe Act to a longer term than 35 years, as such loans are mostly for the charitable purpose of building parochial houses in poor and out of the way districts where repayment is often difficult?

Mr. HANBURY: The hon. Member's proposal could not be carried out without legislation, and I think that experience has shown the disadvantage of piecemeal legislation on the subject of Government loans. I may remind the hon. Member that it is only in Ireland that clergymen are allowed the advantage of borrowing from the Government at all.

VOTERS' LISTS (CO. WESTMEATH).

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been brought to his notice that in the county of Westmeath the tenders for the printing of the voters' lists are decided in secret by the sub-sheriff of the county; and can he state whether the contract for the present year has been given to the lowest tender, and at what price?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: Under the 70th Section of 13 & 14 Vict. c. 69, it is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown and Peace to have the lists of voters prepared and printed. For the expenses incurred by him in this work the Grand Jury pay him such sum as they consider proper. He is not bound to advertise for tenders or to take the lowest tender. In point of fact, the Clerk of the Crown and Peace advertises every year for tenders, and last year accepted the lowest tender, but the work was done so unsatisfactorily that the contractor's tender for £61 was not accepted this year, but the tender for £64, being next in amount to his, was accepted. There is no foundation for the statement that the business was transacted by the sub-sheriff in secret or at all in the Sheriff's office.

Mr. FLAVIN asked to whom the contract was declared?

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND said he was not aware.

Mr. P. O'BRIEN asked the name of the person who sent in the lowest tender that was not accepted.

*The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: A Mr. J. G. Tully.

MULLINGAR UNION.

Mr. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the requisition forms under the Franchise Act of 1885 have not been issued for years past to every occupier in Mullingar Union as directed by the Statute; and, what steps the Local Government Board propose to take to have the provisions of the law enforced in this instance.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Local Government Board have been informed by the Clerk of the Mullingar Union that, so far as he is aware, the requisition forms under the Franchise Act have always been duly served.

RIVER NETHY (INVERNESS-SHIRE).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the water of the River Nethy, in the Badenoch district of Inverness-shire, is polluted by the discharge into the river of sewage from several lodges and large farms above the village of Causer, will he state whether the sanitary or other authority propose to take steps to free the river from pollution and, if so, will action be taken before the arrival of the summer visitors at this fashionable resort?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The matter referred to by the hon. Member is engaging the serious attention of the various authorities whose duty it is to attend to it, with a view, if possible, of overcoming the difficulties, which undoubtedly exist, in dealing with it.

TELEGRAPH EXTENSIONS (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, having regard to the need of telegraph extensions in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and to the fact that the Fishery Board for Scotland are empowered to spend in telegraph guarantees a sum not exceeding £1,500 yearly out of the Herring Brand surplus, will he state why the Fishery Board, instead of spending this amount, have only expended for this purpose £925. 7s. 3d. in 1894, £966. 10s. 11d. in 1895, and £290. 17s. 1d. in 1896?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: I am informed by the Fishery Board that they have not recommended that telegraphic extensions should be guaranteed from the surplus brand fees, as they have always contended in their Reports and otherwise that such extension when in the public interests should be carried out without guarantee. This contention is strengthened by consideration of the limited funds at the disposal of the Board for Harbours which are partly derived from these fees and of the fact that provision has of recent years been made for this service in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland (Public Works and Communications) Vote.

SALLEEN PIER (CO. KERRY).

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if he is aware that great public inconvenience is caused in the shipping of cattle, horses, &c., for want of suitable accommodation at Salleen Pier, county Kerry, where, under ordinary circumstances, animals have to be lowered ten feet from the pier to a boat by the owners themselves; and whether inquiries will be made, from the harbour master, with a view to recommending some improvement to facilitate the public who ship a large number of animals to and from Salleen Pier?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I understand that the shipment of cattle and horses at this pier is very small. The tolls on cattle for the past three months amounted to less than five shillings. The Board of Works are unable, at present, to say whether the inconvenience alleged in the question could be remedied at a reasonable cost, having regard to the traffic and the receipts, but upon these points the Board are making inquiries.

VACCINATION (LYMPH SUPPLY).

SIR WILLIAM PRIESTLEY (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is able to say what course he proposes to take in consequence of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Vaccination as to the lymph supply to be issued in future by the National Vaccine establishment?

MR. CHAPLIN: Shortly after the issue of the Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination I issued fresh Instructions to public vaccinators by which they are enabled, whenever they deem it desirable, to use calf lymph instead of humanised lymph. I have also been making inquiries abroad as to the preparation and employment of glycerinated calf lymph. The Report on this subject has been somewhat delayed by reason of the fact that in some Continental countries public vaccination is practically suspended during the winter months, and is only resumed in May. But, from the information already before me, it is more than probable, in my opinion, that glycerinated calf lymph will be found to present distinct advantages over other forms of vaccine lymph; and one of the points which I shall have to consider will be how far it may be practicable for me to issue a gratuitous supply of vaccine lymph in this form to all registered medical practitioners applying for it. I shall also have to consider how far any considerable change, such as is indicated, in the form or the extent of the lymph supply from the National Vaccine Establishment will be practicable pending fresh legislation on the whole question.

CASTLEBLANEY PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that several persons were summoned by the police of Castleblaney to appear before the Justices of that town last Petty Session Court, and that when the cases were called the police did not appear, and the cases had to be dismissed; and whether he will direct that persons summoned in these instances will be paid their expenses?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Neither the police prosecutor nor the defendants summoned to appear at the Petty Sessions referred to, were in attendance; the cases were not dismissed, but were adjourned by the Court. No hardship was inflicted on the defendants, nor was any expense incurred by them.

JHALAWAR.

MR. W. JONES (Carnarvon, Arfon): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire (Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS), I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether 200 rifles and 50 sabres of the Deoli irregular force have been ordered to Jhalrapatan in view of the unsettled condition of the State of Jhalawar; and whether, seeing that the unrest which this force is intended to deal with is the result of the long period of uncertainty as to the future government of the State, will he consider the advisability of restoring His Highness the late Maharaja Rana to the Gadi, with limited powers and an experienced Political Agent?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received no official information as to the movement of troops to which the Question refers, but assuming that such a movement of troops has occurred, I cannot admit the hon. Member's view as to its cause. As regards the restoration of the Maharaja Rana, I informed the hon. Member on July 21 last year that the decision of the Government of India was final, and I see no reason for altering the view that I then expressed.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanark, Partick): Arising out of this, I wish to ask the Secretary of State for India a Question of which I have given him private notice—whether, in view of the misconduct of the late Maharaja Rana and the failure of heirs, he is not prepared to terminate the uncertainty by restoring Jhalawar to the original parent State of Kotah; and whether such action would not be most in accordance with Rajput customs and the desires of Rajputs?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that the greater part of Jhalawar was part of Kotah, and was ceded on the condition that in the event of the failure of heirs it should lapse to Kotah. Such an arrangement would be in accordance with treaty obligation, and not, I believe, repugnant to the wishes of a majority of the inhabitants.

ARMY STAFF APPOINTMENTS (INDIA).

CAPTAIN PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is the case that, by the Indian Army Regulations, an officer who has passed through a two years' course at the Staff College is still kept on exactly the same footing, as regards claims for staff employment, as one who has merely been through the two months' garrison class and passed the usual examinations for promotion to field rank; and whether the great majority of appointments on the Army Headquarter Staff and District Staff in India are held by officers who are not Staff College graduates; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of altering these Regulations so as to assimilate them with those which prevail in the Home Army, whereby preference in the giving of staff appointments would be given to Staff College Officers, thus enabling the Indian Government to profit to the full extent of the payments which it makes towards the maintenance of the Staff College, and allowing it to give legitimate reward to its officers whom it encourages to pass the course?

*Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The selection of officers for staff employ in India is vested in the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India, and I am confident that in making such selection these authorities weigh carefully the merits and qualifications of all candidates, and that due weight is given to the possession of Staff College certificates. I see no reason to interfere with their discretion, or to alter the Indian Army Regulations, which on this subject are substantially the same as the Queen's Regulations.

FINANCE ACT (NEW SOUTH WALES).

Mr. R. COX (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that, by the provisions of the Finance Act of 1894, hardship is presently inflicted upon the heirs of persons domiciled in this country and dying possessed of movable property in New South Wales, in respect that Death or Estate Duties upon such property are exacted both here and in the Colony, and no allowance is made to executors in the United Kingdom in respect of the duty they have paid in New South Wales; and whether, considering that New Zealand, Victoria, South Australia, and other Colonies have by an Order in Council been brought within the scope of Section 20 of the Finance Act of 1894, there is any immediate prospect of this section being applied to New South Wales by an Order in Council, which will be retrospective in its application?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No application, so far as I am aware, has been made by the Colony of New South Wales to be brought within the scope of Section 20 of the Finance Act, 1894, and I am not in a position to say whether the law of that Colony with regard to death duties is such as to allow of Section 20 being applied to it.

UGANDA RAILWAY.

Mr. R. W. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many miles of the Uganda Railway have been laid and are ready for traffic; what was the total amount expended upon the railway works, including material, up to the 31st March last; and when the First Report and Statement of Accounts of the Railway Committee will be presented to Parliament?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. G. Curzon, Lancashire, Southport): The rails were at mile 58 on May 18. The completed portion of the line will not be open to traffic until after it has been inspected and passed. The final accounts have not yet come in from Mombasa, but the revised estimates of expenditure for 1896-97 amount to £387,000. The papers are in course of preparation and will probably be presented and distributed by the end of next month.

POSTAL DELIVERIES (CIRCULARS).

Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if it is possible to deal with circulars by special deliveries, instead of retaining them and issuing them in lots of 30 at each delivery, as is at present the practice in the eastern district of London?

Mr. HANBURY: It is already the practice to deal with circulars by special deliveries when they are sufficiently numerous, and when their delivery in the ordinary course would appreciably retard the postmen. The practice in the eastern district is the same as in the City and other parts of London.

TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) BILL.

Mr. W. YOUNGER (Lincolnshire, Stamford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Superannuation Bill for Teachers during the present Session; and, if so, if he can mention the probable date of its introduction?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I must refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave on May 10 to a Question on the same subject.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Sale of Food and Drugs Bill will be introduced?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The Bill will be introduced this Session, but I do not think there is much chance of its being passed into law.

MR. DILLON: May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will endeavour to get the Bill passed this Session, inasmuch as two Irish Bills have been blocked, and surely some of the time spent on those Bills might have been spent on this?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: It depends on a general survey of the business of the Session. I am afraid I cannot add anything to the statement I have already made. Of course, if it should unexpectedly turn out that there is a universal enthusiasm for this Bill, it might possibly be carried.

DRAINAGE WORKS (IRELAND).

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is in a position to state if the baronial charges for light railways and drainage works, which are included in the county cess, and press so heavily in some parts of Ireland, will form portion of the rural rates of which the Government propose to pay half for the occupiers?

MR. P. C. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Local Government Bill which he is to introduce next Session will contain any provision for relieving agricultural land in the Lough Erne district from the existing burden of drainage tax?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I think it would not be convenient that, in answer to the Questions before the House, I should deal with questions of detail in a Bill to be introduced next year.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's) asked the Attorney General a question of which he had given private notice—whether he now had any reason to correct the statement he made in Debate in that House on Tuesday last that the Committee could not place much reliance upon the figures given in the said Debate on the authority of Mr. Neison as to the burden of compensation imposed on the coal-mining industry by the Workmen's Compensation Bill, because those figures did not correspond with figures previously supplied by Mr. Neison to Her Majesty's Government; also whether he still had any reason for stating that Mr. Neison had in any way altered the said figures?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Isle of Wight): I am only too glad to have the opportunity of saying that when I spoke the other evening I had only one set of figures given me—namely, those given under date May 18 in the Report of the Labour Commission. Those figures in no way corresponded with the figures quoted by my hon. Friend. I did not know that within an hour or two afterwards there had been another Report respecting another coalfield, which accounted for the difference in the figures. Of course, had I known that, I should not have said that Mr. Neison had altered this figures. I drew the conclusion that the figures had been changed; but, of course, I wish now to withdraw the statement entirely. I wish to add, in order to avoid misunderstanding, that Her Majesty's Government do not consider that either set of Mr. Neison's figures support the conclusion drawn from them.

MR. SETON-KARR: Arising out of the Attorney General's answer, may I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will take into his careful consideration the figures of Mr. Neison to which I have alluded?

MOTION.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM).

Bill to legalise the use of Weights and Measures of the Metric System, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Balfour; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.—[Bill 271.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool) moved:—

> "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expenses of and relating to arbitration which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to amend the law with respect to compensation to workmen for accidental injuries suffered in the course of their employment, and of any compensation that may become payable in respect of accidents to workmen employed by or under the Crown in pursuance of such Act."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said the terms of the Resolution as now submitted cleared up all doubts previously expressed as to whether or not it was sufficiently wide to cover reasonable Amendments on the question of the costs of arbitration and medical officers. The Home Secretary, on the introduction of the Bill, was understood to say that the costs were to be paid by the public. When the Bill was published it was found that the promise was not kept. Since then the Government had undertaken to widen the words of the Bill, and the words before them were wide enough. The Resolution seemed to be satisfactory, and the words used all that could reasonably be asked for.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY only wished to say he could not be held to have given an undertaking with reference to the expenses of the medical officers employed. As regarded the expenses of the arbitrators, he stated that these would be paid by the State, and that when the County Court Judge acted as arbitrator there should be no fees paid in respect of his services.

Resolution agreed to; to be reported To-morrow.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[PROGRESS, 26TH MAY.]

[The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

LIABILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO WORKMEN FOR INJURIES.

(1.) If in any employment to which this Act applies personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act.

(2.) Provided that:—

(*a*) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed;

(*b*) When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect the liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act, except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

(3.) If any question arises as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies, or whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer, or of any person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, or whether the injury was caused by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment of the workman injured, or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, or otherwise as to the liability for compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement, shall, subject to the provisions of the first schedule to this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the second schedule to this Act.

(4). If the Registrar of Friendly Societies certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment is on the whole not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of this Act, the employer may, until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of those workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act, and thereupon the employer shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme, but, save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act.

Another Amendment proposed, in Subsection (3) to insert, as a new sub-section, the words.—

> "(4) Proceedings for the recovery under this Act of compensation for an injury shall not be maintainable unless notice *that injury has been* sustained is given within six weeks, and an arbitration is commenced within six months from the occurrence of the accident causing the injury, or, in case of death, within twelve months from the time of death. Provided always that in case of death the want of such notice shall be no bar to the maintenance of such proceedings if the arbitrator shall be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse for such want of notice. The notice shall be served in the manner provided by the Employers' Liability Act 1880, Section 7."—*(Mr. John Wilson, Falkirk Burghs.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, in line 2, to leave out from the word "notice," to the word "within," in line 4, in order to insert the words "of the claim is given."—(*Mr. Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment." Debate resumed.

Mr. W. J. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.), in view of the fact that there were different Amendments before the House, asked for an explanation from some Member of the Government as to how matters precisely stood.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight) understood that the Colonial Secretary was prepared to accept part of the Amendment which had been suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries. That part of the Amendment was:—

> "Provided always that the want of such notice shall not be any bar to the maintenance of such proceedings unless the arbitrator considers the employer is prejudiced in his defence by the absence of such notice, and the omission to give such notice was with the intention of misleading."

There would have to be some slight alteration of the words. Thus, the expression in the original Amendment "the arbitrator shall be of opinion," would, if adopted, exclude the committee, and the question would arise whether the committee had power to deal with the question, notice not having been given. He thought it would be desirable to alter those words to "it is settled on the arbitration" so as to give power to dispense with notice to the Committee as well as to the arbitrator.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) very much regretted that the Government proposed to take no account whatever of the notice of accident. It seemed to him to be far more important than the claim. If there were no early notice of accident, there would not be an opportunity of immediately sending a medical man to do the best he could for the poor sufferer. But there was another reason. He had known a great many cases, especially in the railway world, where early notice was essential in order to prevent a similar accident occurring on the same spot or ground. He believed that more had been done by early notice of an accident to prevent the occurrence of similar accidents than any other thing he had known. He felt certain from the miners' point of view that notice was necessary to prevent similar accidents occurring. In regard to wages, if this Bill were to add to the question of cost to the employer, the first defect would be that instead of the workmen receiving an advance in wages, the Bill would prove to a certain extent a deterrent against a rise in wages. If that were so they were bound to do the best they could for the workmen by not throwing upon the employer that cost which could be prevented by early notice, and which would deprive a man of the advance in wages which would be due to him.

Mr. R. B. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) agreed with the hon. Baronet about the desirability of early notice of accidents, but cases in which men had failed to give notice for reasonable cause should be provided for. They should save the case of the man who made a *bonâ-fide* mistake, exclude the man who presented a bogus claim, and save the case of the man who, through sheer ignorance had not given notice. He recommended his hon. Friend to accept the view that there should be notice of accident as distinguished from mere notice of claim, if there were a proviso which would include the three main pleas, of mistake, real genuine ignorance, and reasonable excuse.

*MR. EMERSON BAINBRIDGE (Lincoln, Gainsborough) said he was glad to state that he and his hon. Friends had conferred with the representatives of the workmen and of the employers, and had arrived at a solution of the matter which would probably commend itself to the Committee. An Amendment had been agreed to as follows:—

> "Provided that the recovery under this Act of compensation for injury shall not be maintainable unless notice of the accident has been given as soon as practicable after the happening thereof and after claim for compensation with respect to such accident has been made within six months from the occurrence of the accident which caused the injury, or, in case of death, within 12 months of the time of death, provided always such want of notice shall not be a bar to the maintenance of such proceedings unless it is settled on arbitration that the employer is prejudiced in his defence by the absence of such notice, or shall be of opinion that there was reasonable excuse for the want of notice. Notice shall be served in the manner provided for by the Employers' Liability Act 1880, Section 7."

The hon. Member added that a copy of this had been submitted to the Government, and he believed it met with the approval of the Home Secretary. He hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment, and that the Amendment he had submitted would be adopted.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that on behalf of the Government he was prepared to accept the Amendment. As far as he could judge it afforded a reasonable solution of the difficulty raised on both sides of the House. Provided notice of accident did not become a condition precedent, which it might, for technical reasons, be difficult to get over, adequate notice was fair for the employers to expect. He agreed with the ex-Home Secretary that if they made a notice of accident within a fixed period a condition precedent to the workman recovering under the Act, they might be imposing obligations which it would be extremely difficult technically to fulfil and bar claims which no one desired to bar. But it was reasonable that an employer, who had to ascertain what the facts were concerning a particular accident, should have adequate and proper notice. If notice of accident were guarded as in this Amendment, it would do injustice to no one, and adequately meet the reasonable demands of the employers.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Stockport) asked what was meant by the words "as soon as practicable."

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said he believed it was an understanding arrived at by those who knew best the circumstances of the case as regarded employers and employed. It was proposed to give wide powers to the arbitrators to settle such matters.

MR. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) said they might all assent to the Amendment as a reasonable settlement of an undoubted difficulty. His own objections and those of others as to requiring notice were based on their experience of the Employers' Liability Act, 1880. The fixing of time had best be left to the discretion of the arbitrator. The circumstances of different trades and accidents varied so much that if a hard and fast rule were laid down it might lead to injustice.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) asked whether the words "although a claim to compensation in respect of such accident has been made," implied that the proceedings for the recovery of compensation must have been begun; because if not, there would be a sword of Damocles hanging over the head of the employer. If the Attorney General would add the words "after proceedings begun," he thought they would meet his view.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked his hon. Friend not to press that. When the hon. Gentleman remembered that it was contemplated in the first instance the matter might go before the Committee, it would not be apt to speak of the commencement of the proceedings. In his view the commencement of the arbitration was the sending in of the claim.

*MR. J. B. BALFOUR (Clackmannan and Kinross) asked whether the word "practicable" would cover the case of excusable ignorance.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he thought the case would be covered.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said that by this proposed Amendment the function would be vested in the arbitrator on deciding whether or no the notice was reasonable. Although he quite agreed that possibly in the majority of cases the arbitrator would take a reasonable view, and would not allow the workman's cause to be injured by the fact that notice had not been given, yet he had known many cases in which a County Court Judge had said, "I shall apply the Act strictly. I think notice ought to have been given," whereas another County Court Judge would take a totally different view. He thought it would be a most pernicious step to take to make it necessary that either notice of the accident or notice of the claim should be given. Under this Bill the question of compensation only had to be dealt with, and except in the case of wilful misconduct the workman would be entitled to compensation in any case. Therefore, there would be no value in the notice except in the case of wilful misconduct. The effect of insisting on notice would be to shut out men who, but from the absence of notice, would be entitled to compensation. He thought it was most undesirable that the Amendment should be pressed, and he should vote against it.

MR. THOMAS BURT (Morpeth) thought that the Amendment would form a basis of agreement; but his hon. Friend the Member for Gainsborough rather misled the House when he said that the terms had already been agreed upon. Some consultation had taken place in the Lobby it was quite true, and he himself was personally quite prepared to agree to the Amendment, but not exactly in the form in which it now stood. He wanted to include ignorance or mistake, and to those words he attached very great importance.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said the Committee was now engaged in discussing an Amendment not before it, and he thought it would be more convenient that the two Amendments before the House should be withdrawn, and that the hon. Member for Gainsborough should then move his Amendment.

SIR J. JOICEY did not think that it was the intention of his hon. Friend the Member for Gainsborough to say that the exact wording of the Amendment had been approved of by all the representatives of the workmen, but that they substantially had their approval. His hon. Friend the Member for North-west Durham spoke entirely against any notice whatever, but every reasonable person was agreed that some reasonable notice should be given to the employer. ["Hear, hear!"] After all, this Bill conferred an immense boon on the working classes—["hear, hear!"]—and while there was not an employer in the House who wished to place any bar whatever in the way of workmen who were entitled to compensation under the Bill receiving that compensation, yet he thought that every Member in the House, except, perhaps, one or two lawyers—[*a laugh*]—would agree with him that it was absolutely necessary that the employer should be protected as far as possible from bogus claims. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped this Amendment would form a satisfactory settlement, and he thanked his hon. Friend the Member for Lynn for his action the previous night, for had it not been for the hon. Member's intervention, the Amendment proposed last night would have been carried. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) sad he should like to know why the Home Secretary had receded from the position taken up by the Secretary for the Colonies last night. He did not, however, intend to find serious fault, for he wished the Committee not to try captiously for one side to get the better of the other, but to try to come to an agreement which would work well for both parties. ["Hear, hear!"] This question would not be regarded from the lawyers' point of view, as cases would be decided more from practical knowledge of the circumstances than by lawyers' advice. The arbitrator need not be a lawyer. He was more likely to be a common-sense man like himself. [*Laughter.*] The words "ignorance or mistake" covered cases which no other words would cover. They would give no support to bogus claims, but would prevent just claims from being defeated by technical objections. The employers need have nothing to fear; for cases where "ignorance or mistake" was pleaded could be settled by a committee of the trade concerned, and need not come before the arbitrator.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that he could not advise the Committee to accept the word "ignorance," as it would be open to the reasonable objection that ignorance could always be pleaded. But the word "mistake" might be inserted, and that would include cases of genuine ignorance. He proposed that the words should read:—

> "Provided always that the want of such notice shall not be a bar to the maintenance of such proceedings, if it is found in the proceedings for settling a claim that the employer is not prejudiced in his defence by the absence of such notice, or that such absence was occasioned by mistake or other reasonable cause."

Mr. HENRY BROADHURST (Leicester) asked whether there was a vital objection to the words "ignorance of the law."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, a serious objection.

Mr. BROADHURST said that he very much regretted it. [*Laughter.*] How was the workman who was honestly ignorant of the provisions of the Act to escape being penalised? In the case of large industries, where the men were in contact with the unions, there might be no ignorance of the Bill; but the isolated working man would be under a great disadvantage. It was very inconvenient for a long Amendment such as that before the Committee to be suddenly sprung upon hon. Members. He had not been consulted about it, and had only seen it for a few moments. If the Attorney General could accept the phrase "ignorance of the law," he thought that this would relieve the Committee from the difficulty. Otherwise great injustice would be done to many workmen who were isolated from their fellows.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) suggested to the Attorney General that as the hon. and learned Gentleman objected to the word "ignorance" he might be able to accept the word "inadvertence" instead. It would probably cover many of the cases to which reference had been made.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said it was impossible to do this. "Inadvertence" was only another form of "mistake," but if hon. Gentlemen, when they saw the Amendment in print, had any serious objections to the form in which it was incorporated in the section it could be dealt with on the Report stage. At present, however, the Government had endeavoured to meet the objection which had been raised by suggesting the alteration.

Mr. BURNS said he was perfectly content to leave the insertion of the words to the Attorney General. He merely suggested the word because in the Courts he had heard that mistakes were described as "inadvertences."

Mr. CHARLES FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) thought that the Committee would be prepared to accept the Amendment, always reserving to itself the right to judge of it finally on the Report stage.

*Mr. BAINBRIDGE said he was quite prepared to accept the variation of wording proposed.

Mr. BURNS called attention to the description of the mode of serving the notice of accident under Section 7 of the Act of 1880, which insisted that in every case the notice of accident should be by letter, message by hand, or registered letter. It might, however, be inconvenient or impossible, in a case where a man was seriously injured, to comply with the terms of the section; and he suggested that a man who gave verbal notice through his foreman ought to be deemed to have given notice in compliance with the Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that the words in the Amendment moved the previous day were agreed to by the workmen and the employers, and he had never heard of any difficulty arising as to the mode of serving the notice since 1880.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) proposed to leave out Sub-section (4) in order to insert the words:—

> "Any agreement made between an employer and workman for the purpose of contracting themselves out of this Act shall be void."

He pointed out that the Bill covered factories, and that the description of factory was very wide. The Factory Act of 1878 contained a description of no fewer than 26 different kinds of factories; and they were, therefore, placed in this position:—The Registrar of Friendly Societies would have to examine every scheme which came before him in relation to all the different works, and he would have to say whether or not the scheme was, on the whole, not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions for compensation under this Bill. It was utterly impossible for any Registrar, however able, to competently deal with the numerous questions that would arise on the construction of the various schemes. If schemes were allowed and carried out the arbitrator would have thrown upon him the responsibility of construing what the scheme was. [*Cries of* "No!"]

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Under this clause any scheme proposed as a substitute for the Bill would have to obtain a certificate of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and all that would arise subsequently would be that the arbitrator would have to say whether or not there is such a certificate.

*MR. ASCROFT said that if there was a scheme between the employer and the workman, and the question came before the arbitrator, the point might often arise whether or not the workman was to be paid in accordance with the terms of the scheme. If a certificate had been granted the arbitrator would have nothing to do with the Act; he would only have to deal with the scheme as he found it, and would have to construe it. Therefore, they were inaugurating a series of schemes all over the country which the arbitrator would have to construe, and the workmen and the employers would in future be exposed to litigation arising out of the construction of schemes. But there was something even more objectionable. Although the Bill provided that the scheme should be fair and reasonable to the workman, it did not provide anything as to administration and supervision. The friendly societies protested strongly against the policy of this sub-section. It was only recently that the representatives of friendly societies, numbering 2,800,000 Members, met in London. They had a fund of over 27 millions sterling accumulated and invested.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: I fail to see how the remarks of the hon. Member are relevant to the Amendment. He seems to be going rather far afield from the question he wishes to put before the Committee.

*MR. ASCROFT: On consideration, Mr. Chairman, I am certain I was. [*Laughter.*] But he thought he was justified in saying it would only be fair and reasonable if they insisted upon a scheme being forced upon employés, that they should make provision for an annual account being presented or a periodical audit, by which, when complaints arose, the matter could be brought before the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and the scheme cancelled. He might be asked: How could a question of administration arise? He would give a case. Suppose a man entitled, on being injured—

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Order, order! The general position of these insurance societies does not arise at all. The only question is whether the compensation which they propose to give is not as favourable as that given under the Bill. The general position and administration of the societies cannot be discussed here.

*MR. ASCROFT explained that he wished to show that circumstances might arise, and that there was no provision whatever for bringing these circumstances before the Registrar, and that that was an omission which should be supplied in Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: I do not think it would be relevant to insert any Amendments except in so far as they deal with the position of the workman in regard to this Bill—that is to say, whether the compensation is more or less favourable than that which he would get from the Society.

*MR. ASCROFT was afraid the Chairman did not realise the point, but he would not pursue it. He had a happy knack of always saying the wrong thing. [*Laughter.*] It was not from intention, but rather from ignorance of the forms of the House. But there was one point which could not be denied, and that was that any scheme which came before the Registrar without the workman being heard was objectionable. And as soon as they had got the scheme there was this difficulty, that no matter how good the scheme might be, they had the employer on the one side differing with the man who had not a free hand. He considered that there was no advantage or benefit either to employers or workmen in having this Section included, and, therefore, he submitted that the Government would act wisely in removing it from the Bill.

MR. BROADHURST while thinking that not much time need be occupied upon this Amendment, believed the Government would lose nothing by accepting it. If the scheme of contracting out were to be such that the workman should not be placed in a less advantageous position, he did not see what was to be gained for the employer in having a scheme for contracting out at all. He should be glad, however, to hear from the Government what strong reasons could be urged for retaining this clause.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN very much hoped that the recommendation of the hon. Gentleman opposite would be followed. The Government did not wish to exaggerate the importance of the matter, but at the same time they considered that it might be of advantage to the workman to have a sub-section of this kind in the Bill. They did not see why they should profess, even at this stage, to be incapable of error and to have devised a plan which could not by any possibility be improved. Was it not conceivable that an employer and his workmen, considering this matter in the light of the experience of their special trade, and having the most friendly feelings one for the other, might devise a scheme which for them, at any rate, would be much better than the scheme proposed in the Bill? What the Government asked was that the House should not say to them violently, "You shall not have this improved scheme, although you all desire it, and it is proved to be equally as good and perhaps for you much better than the scheme of the Bill."

*MR. EDWARD STRACHEY (Somerset, S.) desired to present the case from the point of view of the friendly societies. When the Employers' Liability Bill introduced by the late Home Secretary came back from another place with the contracting-out clause inserted, Mr. Gladstone argued strongly against contracting out, and cited the opinion of the friendly societies in support of his view; their judgment, the right hon. Gentleman said, being almost decisive of the question. In reply, the First Lord of the Treasury stated that he had not received a single representation from any friendly society indicating that they had any rooted objection to the scheme of contracting out inserted in that Bill by the other House. However that might be, the friendly societies had now made it perfectly clear by the circular which had been issued that they objected without reservation of any kind to this sub-clause relating to contracting out.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN suggested that the point which was being raised by the hon. Member could be dealt with more conveniently when the Amendment which the hon. Member had himself put upon the Paper was reached. That Amendment ran: —

> "The Registrar of Friendly Societies shall not certify any scheme which restrains any workman from remaining in or joining any friendly society."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said that the hon. Member, although he was addressing his remarks to his Amendment, objected to the whole of the sub-clause under consideration, and it was in order for him to ask the House to reject it.

*MR. STRACHEY regretted that he was unable to adopt the suggestion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. But he had been informed that the Amendment standing in his name and which was referred to by the right hon. Gentleman was outside the scope of the Bill, and would be ruled out of order. The National Conference of Friendly Societies had asked him to oppose the whole of the sub-clause. This sub-clause would encourage the formation of benefit societies by employers. To this the friendly societies took objection, fearing that their position might be endangered by the unfair competition of the societies set up by the employers. Cases would arise in which men would be told that they must join an employer's society as a condition of their employment, and in certain industries the wages were not such as would enable a workman to be a member of more than one benefit society. The direct effect of the sub-section, therefore, could not but fail to be prejudicial to the existing friendly societies. He had been sent a statement by the Secretary of the Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, giving the case of a workman who had been told by his employers that he must leave the Hearts of Oak Society, to which he belonged, and join their own club. The hon. Member proceeded to read the communication, which was of considerable length. Before he had reached the end,

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said the hon. Member was taxing the patience of the Committee. The hon. Member was objecting generally to the fourth sub-section upon the ground that friendly societies might be injured by its operation. That hardly justified his reading long extracts. The hon. Member ought to state his reasons for objecting more generally, and abstain from going into such details. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. STRACHEY said that if the Chairman ruled that he must not place the case fully before the Committee, he would, of course, bow to the hon. Gentleman's decision.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS observed that he had not given any such ruling as that. He believed the hon. Member was quite competent to put his case fully before the Committee without reading long and elaborate extracts. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. STRACHEY said he would, of course, follow the advice of the Chairman. The end of the case to which he was referring was that the man, because he refused to resign his membership of the Hearts of Oak Society, was in consequence given notice to leave, and lost his employment.

MR. GALLOWAY asked for a fuller explanation than had yet been given to the Committee of the character of the schemes which the Registrar of Friendly Societies was to be empowered to certify. There was one other point which was not quite clear from the Bill—that was whether the certificate which the Registrar was to give would be applied not alone to accident funds which might be formed after the Bill was passed, but also to those that were already in existence. It had been said that one of the strong objections which friendly societies had to contracting out was that it competed with them in their sphere of work; and the Resolution of the National Conference of Friendly Societies had been quoted in support of that contention. But the Resolution proved nothing of the sort. The Resolution said, first of all, that the Conference protested against employers having the power to contract out of the Act. He entirely agreed with that. He thought the workman should be allowed to choose for himself what course he would adopt. The Resolution then went on to say that the Conference protested against restraining in any way the liberty of action of the workmen in joining any friendly society. He agreed that it was most unjust for an employer to say to a workman that he should have his friendly society lodge where he made friendships, such as the employer made at his club, and compel him to do so under threat of dismissal. But he submitted that the Resolution in no way justified the hon. Member in saying that the friendly societies took up the selfish position of objecting to any of their fellow workers getting a larger benefit than they could themselves provide. He agreed that it would be well to secure that the certificate of the Registrar should only be given where it was proved the scheme was actuarially sound, or in a condition to pay all the benefits it professed to be able to pay.

MR. S. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow) said the Amendment raised one of the most important points connected with the Bill. The power of contracting out of the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 had given the greatest possible dissatisfaction to the whole of the working classes of the country. [*Ministerial cries of* "No!"] Therefore it was natural that they should look with very grave suspicion on any proposal which would allow the opportunity of contracting out of the provisions of this Measure. He would like to know how those schemes were to be created. Was the Registrar of Friendly Societies to draw up the schemes himself, or was he to consult the workmen and the employers? There was another important point. If a body of workmen agreed to enter into an arrangement with their employer, would the employer have the right to make the acceptance of the arrangement a condition of hiring? He was certain that if those schemes contained a condition of hiring it would be greatly resented by the working classes of the country. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. G. WHITELEY hoped the Government would stand firm by the sub-clause and that the Committee would reject the Amendment. It seemed to him that the Amendment restricted the liberty of action and the rights of the working people of the country, and dealt with them as if they were children unable, in this matter to look after themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] If the Bill were passed the working classes would undoubtedly secure valuable provisions for compensation in cases of accident; but if workmen in conjunction with their employers could devise and elaborate a scheme which they thought more desirable or beneficial to them than the provisions of the Bill, why should they be debarred from doing so? ["Hear, hear!"] He controverted the statement of the hon. Member for Walthamstow that contracting out had given a great deal of dissatisfaction to the whole of the working classes of the country. In the borough he represented there was a large body of railwaymen who were members of the Mutual Insurance Society of the London and North-Western Railway, and they valued its benefits so highly that when, in 1893, it was proposed under the Bill of the late Home Secretary to prevent contracting out, they sent him numerous Resolutions and representations in favour of maintaining the principle.

MR. BURNS said he did not understand the hon. Member for Walthamstow to say that all the members of the working classes were opposed to contracting out.

MR. G. WHITELEY said he took down the hon. Member's words, which were that contracting out had given the greatest possible dissatisfaction to the whole of the working classes of this country.

MR. BURNS said that statement might be qualified, perhaps, but at all events 999 workmen out of 1,000 objected to it. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] The Oddfellows, one of the largest benefit societies in the world, whose membership was nearly a million, were unanimous as a society against contracting out. The National Conference of Friendly Societies which met the other day, where nearly three million members were represented by elected delegates, decided unanimously that contracting out was a principle which ought not to be allowed by law. The Trades Union Congress, which, whatever its political difference might be, was generally united on industrial matters, came to a similar decision. During the last ten years all the friendly societies and all the trades unions, representing roughly six million working class members, had protested against contracting out being allowed. The Secretary for the Colonies the other night had said this was a clause which allowed contracting out only in cases where the terms offered to the workmen were better than those contained in the Bill, and their object in inserting the clause was that they did not wish to prevent a workman doing better for himself by the consent and good will of his employer than legislation could do for him. The right hon. Gentleman assumed that these contracting out schemes were based upon good will, and were matters of friendly arrangement between masters and men. That was not so—["hear, hear!"]—and could not be so, so long as assent to a contracting-out scheme was a condition of employment. These schemes were imposed upon the workmen, not collectively, but individually, when they were out of work. They therefore interfered with the liberty of contract—["hear, hear!"]—and the freedom of combination, and the men collectively had no voice whatever in determining the benefits, the superannuation, or the other conditions which were submitted to them. When men did object their promotion was not so rapid and their dismissal occasionally followed. He did not see why the masters and the workmen collectively should not be consulted by the Registrar as to the equivalent to the Bill. He submitted, however, that all existing contracting-out societies should be abolished, and the opinion of the workmen as to the equivalent ascertained by means of a secret ballot. He contended that this Bill ought not to infringe on sick, superannuation, funeral, or other benefits. The fact was they were giving too much work to the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and referendum to a Registrar would be a most objectionable form of tyranny. If the Registrar were fair he would kill all the contracting-out schemes submitted to him, for there was not one of them which gave its members actuarially anything like the financial benefits which the workmen got from their benefit and friendly societies. [*Laughter.*] If that were done, they would have the railway companies and other big monopolies coming to that House for amended Bills, besides pressure being brought to bear upon the House in other ways. There was only one way, and that was to give to masters and men absolute freedom of employment and of organisation. He would not put it even in the hands of the Board of Trade, but would leave it to voluntary effort. He cited the case of an engine driver in his own district who received 35s. a week. This man belonged to the Hearts of Oak, to which he paid 10d. or 11d. a week, and another society to which he paid 1s., and he paid 6d. a week to his trade union. This man was compelled, as a condition of employment, to pay 4d. or 6d. a week towards a contracting-out scheme. He could not pay more than 2s. 6d. out of 35s. a week, and he was thus driven to choose between keeping on his connection with the Hearts of Oak, which gave him 18s. a week when sick, or join the contracting-out scheme which gave him 10s. a week. Moreover, if he was dismissed by the railway company he got no surrender value for what he had paid in, and if then his health failed him he would have no means of support. These contracting-out schemes sometimes precluded the poorest of our workmen from joining friendly societies, and absolutely prevented them from joining trade unions, and in this way made intimidation possible. He would agree with these arrangements in the abstract if they gave the workmen value for their money, but they did not, and therefore could not be defended. In practice, also, they tied men down to one district, and prevented the mobility of labour. If they wished to kill contracting-out schemes by this Bill let them do so on the front-door step, and not strangle them in the back yard. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] The contracting-out system was one of the most nefarious systems of compulsion which had ever been sanctioned by that House.

COLONEL MELLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said he regretted very much the tone of the speech of the hon. Member. He had pledged himself against contracting out because he believed that the great majority of the working men of this country viewed contracting out with suspicion. ["Hear, hear!"] They looked on it as something humiliating to them. But this Bill dealt with the matter on a totally different basis. They were told that the working man would not contract himself out unless he satisfied the Registrar of Friendly Societies that he was going to get something better than that which he relinquished. There was nothing like compulsion in the Bill. If what was suggested were to take place he should vote against the proposal. Surely that House would stultify itself if they prevented the working man enjoying benefits of this character. They had heard a great deal about benefit societies. Were they legislating for the sake of benefit societies or for the benefit of working men who were injured in the course of their employment? He should be the last man to say a word against the benefit societies, which were great and valuable institutions. But there was something more important, and that was preserving the liberties of the subject—["hear, hear!"]—and if workmen saw their way to falling into an arrangement that would be for their benefit the Members of that House would not be doing their duty if they imposed obstacles.

*MR. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) thought that the Member who had just sat down had hardly read the Bill. Perhaps when the Home Secretary got up to make a statement he would tell them in what part of the sub-section provision was made for the workman to go before the Registrar. What was the meaning of the word "contract?" Why was this alternative scheme placed before them? Was the employer going to give more than was given under the Bill? The employers looked on this Bill as a burden placed upon them. ["Hear, hear!"] What, beyond this Bill, were the employers going to give the workmen? Were they going to give the workmen better terms? He apprehended the employer would expect to get something in return for his money. What they said on behalf of the men was that this contracting-out scheme ought not to be allowed. He believed that the working men of the country were opposed to it. He did not think that the Secretary for the Colonies was enamoured of this clause; and did not care whether it was passed or not. He hoped, therefore, that the Secretary for the Colonies would agree to have the clause eliminated and so allow the workmen to receive the full benefit which the Bill proposed to give. To many men like those who were working on railways at a low wage, and who were qualified for a higher post to which they could not attain, this proposal would be a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. He appealed to the Secretary for the Colonies not to destroy what benefits might be contained in the Bill.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said he had been asked whether the Government attached importance to this clause. Well, he had said at the opening of the Debate that if there were one thing to which the Government were pledged it was to embody in that Bill the principle of enabling employer and employed to make their own terms. ["Hear, hear!"] It was no fault of the Government to have fulfilled that pledge. If they had not done so they would have been open to a serious charge of having violated their pledges. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Walthamstow said the workmen of the country viewed with general dissatisfaction the principle of contracting out. It was, however, notorious that in the Division upon the question in Committee on the Bill of the late Government the Ministerial majority fell to the most narrow margin. And, without desiring to introduce any matter of a controversial character, he might fairly recall to the recollection of hon. Members the fact that in many constituencies at the last general election it was made a test question whether workmen should be allowed to contract out. The result was a Unionist majority of 150. [*Ironical Opposition cheers.*] He did not say that the Unionist majority of 150 was actually due to the decision on that question, but he affirmed that from those constituencies where contracting out was practically made a test question there was no evidence forthcoming that the principle of contracting out was unpopular with the electorate. All the evidence, electoral and otherwise, which they had pointed to the conclusion that there was a general desire on the part, not only of employers, but of workmen, to be allowed, under certain conditions, to make their own contracts. As to friendly societies, he assured the Committee that the last thing the Government wished to do was in any way to injure such societies. Their desire was to carry the friendly societies with them, and their belief was that there was nothing in the Bill which would prevent those societies giving supplemental aid in the cases which arose. Of course, as he had already admitted, the question of contracting out came before the Committee in a different shape from that in which it came up under the Bill of his right hon. Friend opposite. ["Hear, hear!"] This Bill conferred larger benefits upon the working man than the Bill of his right hon. Friend. It conferred definite, if limited, pecuniary advantages upon the workman; but if a mutual society chose to arrange that, by some machinery different from that of the Bill, it would provide benefits like those given by the Bill and go further and give even other benefits, such as aid in time of sickness, he was at a loss to see how the workman could be prejudiced. The Registrar General, a most capable and able officer, would, when a mutual scheme was brought before him, estimate the whole benefits under the scheme, and see that, if workmen contributed to the scheme, they would get a *quid pro quo* for their subscription over and above what the employers were bound to give under the Bill. If the Government were right in proposing the measures of compensation they had laid before the Committee, surely they were right in providing that if a permanent or mutual society chose to adapt themselves in any way to the new conditions, there should be a field open to them. He trusted that the Committee would, without much further delay, come to a decision upon this question. The Government had purposely made the wording of the clause wide. They did not believe in tying up the Registrar of Friendly Societies too closely. They believed they had sufficiently indicated that there was thrown upon him the obligation of seeing in those cases where schemes were brought before him, that, upon the whole, the workman would have by mutual agreement at least as favourable terms as he would have under the Bill.

MR. ASQUITH said they had heard a good many theories as to the causes of the magnitude of the present Ministerial majority, but it was novel to him to hear that it was attributable to the desire of the working classes to have the privilege of contracting themselves out of rights which the law would otherwise give them. [*Opposition cheers.*] The right hon. Baronet had spoken of what he called test constituencies. There was one constituency which would afford a better test almost than any other—[*cheers*]—of the opinion of the working classes upon this and most other questions, and yet Her Majesty's Government would not allow the electors in that constituency to express their opinion. [*Ministerial cries of* "Oh!" *and Opposition cheers.*] Well, he had looked carefully at the other side, and neither to-night, nor, so far as he knew, in the course of these discussions had he seen the hon. Member for Crewe in his place. [*Renewed cheers.*] However, he was anxious not to discuss this matter in a spirit of party recrimination. He must say the question of contracting out had assumed a different complexion, and was of very much less practical importance to-day than it was when it was raised three years ago in connection with the Bill of the late Government. ["Hear, hear!"] But, having made that admission, he must express his surprise that the Government had thought it worth while to introduce this clause. ["Hear, hear!"] He could not for the life of him see, except as a piece of pious homage to an abstract principle, what possible effect the clause would have in protecting workmen. A mutual scheme must either be as good as the scheme proposed by the Government, or less good than that scheme. If it were less good than the scheme proposed by the Bill, then, notwithstanding the right hon. Gentleman's rather rhetorical language about the expediency of allowing workmen to make their own contracts, the Registrar of Friendly Societies was bound to pronounce against it, and prevent the men from acting upon it. On the other hand, if the scheme were as good as, or better than, the provision made under the Bill, what was the necessity for allowing contracting out? If an employer were to give as much under a scheme as the law forced him to give, what possible inducement had an employer to require a man to forego the benefits which the law gave him? That appeared to him to be a dilemma from which there was no possible escape, and, that being so, it showed, not that this clause was noxious, but that it was totally unnecessary. He must go on to say that, having had some considerable number of these schemes brought under his notice in connection with the employers' liability legislation of the late Government, he had never seen, and he did not know of, any which would satisfy the conditions contained in this clause. The scheme which was the great stalking horse in the battle of that time—the North Western scheme—would not hold water for a minute if the test of this clause were applied to it. That, he thought, was a tribute—a tribute which he made most willingly—to the comparative generosity of the scheme proposed by the Bill. But it was not unworthy of remark that, if that were the case, it showed they were not going, in point of fact, by the operation of this clause, to protect these schemes. On the contrary, they were going to require, he thought he might almost say without exaggeration, 99 out of every 100 of the existing associations to be completely remodelled from top to bottom—["hear, hear!"]—and that with very little benefit, as far as he could see, either to the employer or to the men. If, as he thought he had shown, the clause were not needed for the protection of sound schemes, for what purpose was it put in the Bill? He accepted entirely the statement which the Government made of their object, but let them consider what they were going to do. They were going to put on the shoulders of the Registrar of Friendly Societies—an official as to whose competency in his own duties he made no suggestion whatever—a task of enormous perplexity—["hear, hear!"]—for the performance of which, however skilled he might be in the determination of actuarial questions, neither he nor any other Government Department possessed the necessary knowledge, the necessary experience, or the necessary powers of judgment. It was all very well to say, in the vague language of this clause, that the Registrar was to certify that a scheme was, on the whole, not less favourable to the workman than the Bill, but what a problem they were presenting to the Registrar! What had he got to take into account? If it were a mere question of whether the amount contributed by the employer independent of the amount contributed by the men—if the scheme were perfectly solvent in other respects—would or would not produce a benefit equal to that contained in the schedule, that was not an insoluble problem. But unfortunately these schemes were not of that simple character. They were not simple accident schemes. They were schemes which contained a number of other provisions relating to other matters. Take such an elementary thing as this. Was the Registrar to consider whether or not it was made a condition of employment that every man who entered into the service of a particular employer should contribute to the funds? That was a fundamental consideration—["hear, hear!"]—because, although he did not want to use exaggerated language about this matter, he was perfectly certain that the imposition of that condition as one of the terms of employment was found to a very large extent to fetter the men's freedom of action, and was undoubtedly introduced with the object of making these funds insurance funds against strikes, against labour disputes, and, indeed, against labour organisations. [*Cheers.*] He did not say that that, from the employers' point of view, was an illegitimate thing, but no one would deny that that was an element which did not enter into the calculation of those by whom these schemes were promoted. That was only one particular provision in regard to these schemes, but as a matter of fact they contained clauses, extremely complex in their character, which related not merely to the payment for accidents or even sickness, but very often to the general conditions of employment, and to the regulation of the every-day relations of masters and men. How the Registrar of Friendly Societies was going to disentangle from this mass of complicated provisions those parts, and those parts alone, which related to accident insurance, and how, having segregated that part from the rest, he was going to determine whether or not in any given set of circumstances they must be as favourable to the workman as that proffered to him by this Bill, was a matter which he confessed passed his comprehension. He did not think—and he was not saying this in any spirit of undue hostility or carping criticism—this would be found to be a practical way of dealing with the question. If there were any serious object to be gained then he should say by all means let them even run some risk in trying the experiment, but inasmuch as he had endeavoured to show there was no practical object whatever, either in the interests of the masters or of the men, he did earnestly trust the Government might be disposed to reconsider their position in regard to this matter and to drop altogether this sub-section, which excited a good deal of suspicion among the representatives of the working classes, and which would not lead either to the integrity of their own scheme or to the attainment of the objects which both sides had in the prosecution of this legislation.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN asked whether they were really not wasting too much time over matters of secondary importance when they had in face of them questions of very great importance and perplexity? He had observed that the Government did not attach an exaggerated importance to this matter, and now his right hon. Friend opposite, although he found it necessary to criticise it and to object to some of its features, felt that, on the whole, in view of the changes which had been made since the matter was discussed on the occasion on which he introduced his Bill, it was not a matter of practical importance.

MR. ASQUITH: Of not so much importance.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he agreed. He could only say that he did not think the clause would be found in practice to give rise to any of those imaginary evils which had been conjured up by several hon. Members. There was no man better qualified to undertake this duty than the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and he was informed that, although he acknowledged it might cast some additional work upon him, he did not anticipate any difficulty in carrying it out. There was a great fear on the part of some hon. Members lest any scheme suggested under this clause should be enforced upon a workman as a condition of hiring. Well, there was an Amendment on the Paper which was supposed to prevent that, so far as legislation could prevent it, and to which the Government had no objection whatever. [*Cheers.*] Only let him remind his hon. Friends who believed that by legislation they could prevent a matter of this kind that they were entirely mistaken. ["Hear, hear!"] They might say that no such condition should be enforced, but they could not help an employer or his managers allowing it to be known that he would require such and such things from his workpeople, and that he would not employ any workpeople unless they complied with them. That was true of every condition of trade, and no legislation which they could enact would prevent it. Even if there were no contracting-out clause, it would still be possible for an employer to make arrangements, and no legislation would prevent that, although it might be worth while to insert such a provision in the Bill in order to indicate what they considered would be right and what they desired should be done. His right hon. Friend opposite asked whether they really thought that any employers would offer better terms under a scheme of this kind than were proposed in the Bill. He did think so, very much. He did not agree with his right hon. Friend that there were no such schemes at present. On the contrary, he could himself quote an important firm that already gave better terms, although they were rather differently framed from those offered in the Bill; and he did not see why, especially in the trades which were not really dangerous—like the textile industry, for instance—and where the operation of this Bill would not be more than from a shilling to half-a-crown per cent. of the wages, a generous employer should not be prepared to come forward with a scheme which would give a good deal more than the scheme of the Bill. Then, said his right hon. Friend, if he offered a scheme of that kind, why did they want a contracting-out clause? What the employers said, and what he thought experience showed had sometimes occurred, was that, if they had not the security of a contracting-out clause, their workpeople might take advantage, as it were, of two worlds. They might take the scheme which the employers offered when it was to their advantage, and they might go back to the scheme of the Bill in any particulars in which they considered they got greater advantages, although it had been a tacit condition that they should accept the employers' scheme not as a part, but as a whole. When he added to these considerations the fact that very many hon. Gentlemen were pledged to the principle of contracting-out, he thought he had given sufficient reasons for introducting this clause. He hoped they might now come to a decision, at all events, on the principle of the clause.

Mr. FENWICK said it was some satisfaction to learn that the Government did not look with disfavour, at all events, upon the Amendment to prevent contracting out being made a condition of hiring. He did not agree with the Home Secretary that the Government needed no justification for the insertion of this principle in the Bill, because the whole of their attitude in 1893 was in favour of contracting out. That was perfectly true, and if the Government had introduced an Employers' Liability Bill instead of a Compensation Bill, he could have understood that there would have been some force in the argument of the right hon. Gentleman. But this was not such a Bill as was contemplated in 1893. He certainly thought, with the late Home Secretary, that the Government would have been well advised to have omitted the contracting-out principle from the Bill. He did not think any employer was likely to offer any contracting-out scheme giving better terms than the workman was entitled to under the Bill. It was very significant that when the Colonial Secretary, in his reply to his right hon. Friend, said there were many employers who would offer their workmen much better terms than the Bill gave, that observation was received with very faint cheers from the Government side of the House, or from employers. He certainly did not think, as he had said, that employers were at all likely to offer any better terms. He would ask the Home Secretary's attention to this question. The sub-section contemplated the formation or creation of mutual insurance schemes. Upon whose initiative were those schemes to be sanctioned? Were the workmen to be consulted in any way as to the constitution of these schemes? If not, he was bound to say that he agreed with the criticisms which had been made that the sub-section was very crudely drawn, because there was nothing giving the workman any right whatever to be consulted in the constitution of a scheme that was to be submitted to the Registrar for his approval. Now, if the scheme were to be framed on the initiative of the employer, and on his initiative it was to receive the sanction of the Registrar, he was bound to say there was great danger that the scheme might be forced upon great bodies of workmen against their wishes and contrary to their desires. If the Government intended to retain this principle in their Bill, they ought to introduce some form of provision which would give the workman an equal right with the employer to be represented when any such scheme was being framed for submission to the Registrar, and unless they recognised that right, the Measure would still remain very imperfect. He regretted that the Government had at all attempted to introduce this principle of contracting out into a Measure which dealt, not with employers' liability, but was simply and purely a Compensation Bill. He repeated that they would have had every justification in the policy they had pursued of late years for introducing the principle of contracting out into an Employers' Liability Bill, but they were not at all justified in introducing it into a Bill of this kind. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He hoped the Government would not retain the principle in their Bill.

MR. TOMLINSON, who rose amid continued cries of "Divide!" said there had been some confusion as to what would happen under the Bill. The only arrangements that could be made under it were those affecting accidents. As an employer, he would have nothing to do with any alternative scheme unless he was satisfied the workmen of their own motion desired it. [*Cries of* "Divide!"]

MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens) said that if the Amendment were carried to a Division, he should certainly vote against it. [*Cries of* "Divide!" and "Order!"] But if he could get a satisfactory answer on one point it would make him support the Bill much more heartily than he did at the present moment. It was said on the part of the Government that the friendly societies would supplement the Bill, and the hope had been expressed that they would not suffer in consequence of it. He had already criticised the Bill on the ground that it would damage the friendly societies, and although he had carefully listened to the Colonial Secretary's speeches, he had not heard a word that did not confirm his doubts on that point. He should be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman would only give him an answer that would relieve his mind as to the danger contained in the Bill for these societies. [*"Cries of "Divide!"*]

Question put, "That the words 'If the Registrar of Friendly Societies' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 170; Noes, 97.—(Division List, No. 219.)

*MR. ASCROFT moved in Sub-section (4) after the word "societies," to insert the words "after ascertaining the views of the employers and workmen or either of their representatives." He observed that at the present moment there was nothing in the Bill to provide that the Registrar should take any steps whatever to ascertain whether the workmen had been consulted. The position, therefore, would be that an employer without consulting his workmen might send a scheme to the Registrar of Friendly Societies which he might approve, and unless every workman consented to join it he might lose his employment. He was desirous that both the representatives of the workmen and of the employers should be consulted, and an Amendment such as this would certainly tend to make the Bill more workable.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said he was willing to accept the Amendment if the words "or either of their representatives" were left out.

*MR. ASCROFT agreed to the omission of these words.

Amendment, as amended by the omission of the words "or either of their representatives," agreed to.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) moved in Sub-section (4) after the word "certifies," to insert the words "with the approval of the Secretary of State." He regarded this Amendment as necessary in the event of the Registrar of Friendly Societies not being able to do his work properly. He did not desire to indicate for one moment that the present Registrar was not prepared to do his work properly, but he thought the workmen ought to have some check on the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and if they introduced a Government department into this clause they could then debate any question in that House in the event of the Registrar of Friendly Societies failing to perform his work properly, or abusing the powers conferred upon him by this section.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY thought that the hon. Gentleman by his Amendment was asking a Government Department to do a very great deal more than it could carry out. There was no objection to the Registrar of Friendly Societies being under the Home Office for certain purposes, but to insist on every scheme being considered and approved by the Home Office—after having been certified by the Registrar General—before it could come into operation was asking too much. He was afraid, therefore, he could not accept these words, though he was willing to consider whether what he gathered to be the hon. Gentleman's object could not be secured in some other way.

MR. A. H. DYKE ACLAND (York, W. R., Rotherham) considered that the objection the hon. Member had raised was not unreasonable and that there should be some method of raising any question which might arise in connection with this matter in the House of Commons on some particular Vote.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfar) would like to give a reason for associating some one else with the Registrar of Friendly Societies in this matter. Hitherto the simple registration of a Friendly Society had been mistaken for a guarantee of solvency by intending members. Some friendly societies were in a stronger financial position than others and registration should not be allowed in any sense to be mistaken for a guarantee of solvency in any direction. If the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the past reports of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and to past literature on the subject, he would find that that aspect of the question had been discussed. It would be well to associate some Government Department in the work it was proposed to give to the Registrar under this Bill.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY undertook to consider the matter.

MR. J. A. PEASE said that, in these circumstances, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. A. Pease

*COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) moved, in Sub-section (4), after the word "insurance," to insert the words, "whether mutual or otherwise." He said that as he was anxious to see the Bill passed in a workable form he would not take a minute to move his Amendment, and judging from precedent he was afraid the Attorney General would not take much longer to reject it. His reason for moving it was that if these words were not inserted the Registrar of Friendly Societies might debar mutual associations on the ground that the men having to contribute anything at all would make them on the whole less favourable than the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL stated that the hon. Member, as far as regarded the probable reception of the Amendment, appeared to be that very rare being a true prophet. He submitted the words would not be appropriate and it would not be right to describe an arrangement or scheme of the kind as in any sense mutual insurance. It could not be a mutual insurance association to which the masters contributed but from which they would derive no benefit. He objected to the insertion of the words, and did not believe that any harm would result to mutual societies from the Bill.

*COLONEL DENNY said he would rather lose his Amendment than his character as a prophet—[*laughter*]—and he begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. STRACHEY had on the Paper an Amendment proposing, in Sub-section (4), after the word "employment," to insert the words:—

"does not interfere with their membership of any friendly society or the benefits derivable therefrom and."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said the Amendment was not in order, as it went beyond the purpose of the Bill.

*SIR C. DILKE on behalf of Mr. T. G. ASHTON (Beds, Luton) moved, in Sub-section (4), after the words "employment is," to insert the words, "so far as regards the contributions of the employer in particular, and." He said he moved the Amendment to get the opinion of the Government whether the words of the sub-section were clear. The sub-section had been misread and misunderstood. Contracting out in the old bad sense was dead, but it was believed it would continue in an aggravated form in the clause unless clearly provided against.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he did not think the clause, although it was a difficult one to draft, was open to that adverse criticism. He opposed the insertion of the words of the Amendment, which would not have any elucidatory or clarifying effect.

*SIR C. DILKE said he only wished it to be made clear that there will be no deductions from the wages of the workmen for the purposes of the Bill. He withdrew the Amendment, but suggested that the Government should further consider the matter before Report.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. PERKS, on behalf of Mr. HALDANE, moved, in Sub-section (4), to leave out the words, "on the whole not less favourable," and to insert the words "more beneficial."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said it would be very unwise to alter the clause as suggested, and the adoption of the words would throw an extremely difficult task on the Registrar General.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 64.—(Division List, No. 220.)

On the return of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS, after the usual interval,

MR. J. WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) moved an Amendment to the effect that if the Registrar of Friendly Societies certified that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment was on the whole not less favourable to the workmen "and others deriving right through them" than the provisions of the Bill, the employer might contract with any of the workmen that the provisions of the scheme should be substituted for the provisions of the Bill. He urged that, though the Amendment involved a point of detail, it was of importance to employers in Scotland, who had been advised by the late Lord Advocate that they had not the power to contract themselves out of the Employers' Liability Act of 1880. It was therefore desirable to extend to Scotland the same rights that existed in England.

*MR. T. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) stated that, having had an opportunity of consulting the Lord Advocate and the agent of the Mine Owners' Association of Scotland, he found that they were agreed that the Amendment would not meet the case.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said the Amendment would defeat the object, and suggested that the case would be met by inserting after "workman" the words "and their dependants." If that were accepted he should take care to insert in the schedule a definition of "dependants."

*MR. J. B. BALFOUR agreed with the view stated by the learned Attorney General. According to the law of Scotland certain persons had an indefeasible claim in their own right, not derived through husband or father, and therefore the words "deriving right through them" would not touch that case. He had himself handed in a definition of "dependants" which, he thought, would cover the Scotch case.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved in Sub-section (4) after the words "favourable to the workmen," to insert the words, "and their dependants."

Amendment agreed to.

MR. GALLOWAY moved in Sub-section (4) after the words "provisions of this Act,' to insert the words,

"and also certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workman in any employment does not contain any obligation upon the workman to join in such scheme."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL suggested that it might save time if he stated that the Government were prepared to accept the principle of the Amendment later on, but in a more desirable form of words, namely,

"No scheme shall be so certified which contains an obligation upon the workmen to join the scheme as a condition of their hiring."

MR. GALLOWAY had no hesitation in accepting the words suggested by the Attorney General, and refrained from moving his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. J. A. PEASE said he begged to move in Sub-section (4) after the word "Act," to insert the words, "and certifies that the financial position of such a scheme is satisfactory." It would be hard lines on a workman that he should go on contributing for weeks and months and even years, it might be, to a scheme which was unsatisfactory, and from which, after all, he would derive nothing in the event of an accident befalling him.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked the hon. Member for Tyneside not to press his Amendment at this stage. He had not had notice of it, and the matter had not been considered from that point of view. His reason for asking that was this, that they should have to consider later on whether any steps ought to be taken to make anybody bound. He was not sufficiently acquainted with the position of the Registrar General to be able to say whether he would be the sort of authority that ought to deal with the financial capabilities of schemes, and in the event of a fund coming to an end owing to the number of claims made upon it, an objection might be raised by an employer. "This was certified by the Registrar, and therefore I ought not now to be made liable." The point could be discussed in line 18 at the end, and in the meantime he should have an opportunity of ascertaining the views of the Home Secretary upon the matter.

MR. J. A. PEASE said that if the Government would undertake to consider the matter at the end of line 18 he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. ASCROFT, when called upon to move the next Amendment to Sub-section (4)—after the words "employer may," to insert the words—

> "so long as he complies with the provisions of such scheme and fairly administers the same or"—

said he understood from the Attorney General that the question was intended to be dealt with by the Government at a later stage. He, therefore, did not move the Amendment.

MR. GALLOWAY, on behalf of Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH, moved in Sub-section (4) after the words "contrary made," to insert the words "before or." He said that the friendly societies considered this a matter of the utmost importance, because it seemed to them, and to him, that it would distinctly define once and for all that the certificate of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies applied not only to any schemes which should be made after the commencement of this Act, but also to any schemes which were in force at the present moment, and before the Act was passed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said the proper way of dealing with existing agreements was pointed out in Clause 4, as they were, he believed almost in terms proposed to be enacted by the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. Section 4 provided that any contract existing at the commencement of the Act should be deemed to continue

> "after the time at which the workman's contract of service would determine if notice of the determination thereof were given at the commencement of this Act."

He thought it was obvious that the question of existing contracts ought to be dealt with on that clause and not now.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. R. McKENNA (Monmouth, N.) moved to add the following new Sub-section to Clause 1:—

> (5.) Where the injury is caused by the wilful and wrongful act of any person in the service of the workman's employer, the employer shall be as responsible for such act or default as if the workman had not been a workman of nor in the service of the employer nor engaged in his work.

He thought that after what had fallen from various Members of the Government with regard to the doctrine of common employment there could be no objection to the acceptance of this Amendment. All he proposed to do was to do away with the doctrine of common employment.

MR. TOMLINSON: On a point of order, asked whether this Amendment was within the scope of the Bill. As he understood, it amounted to an Amendment of the provisions of the Employers' Liability Act.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said that if the Amendment were inserted it could only apply to the employments to which this Act applied. It was therefore in order.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL thought the words were either unnecessary or absolutely mischievous. When he first saw the Amendment he thought it was intended to be put down with the view to some such clause not being adopted as was now in the Bill. He thought that what the hon. and learned Member was afraid of was already met in substance by Sub-section (2), paragraph (*b*) of the clause, and if it were not, the Amendment would be open to serious objection. By that sub-section the arbitrator would have decided that the employer was liable for the injuries caused either

> "by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible."

After that the only thing that was left was the assessment of damages. Therefore, from the point of view of making the employer liable in the particular case which was contemplated by Sub-section (2), paragraph (*b*), the words were not necessary. If the hon. and learned Member got these words in, they being unnecessary for the purposes of that Sub-section, then it would be open to the suggestion that the doctrine as to the liability of the employer for the workman's default had been extended and altered. If any such words must be inserted, they should be put in all the conditions under which the employer was to be liable in the issue which was going to be decided by the arbitrator. To put in these words now would, as he had said, either be to extend the scope of the Bill beyond what the Committee intended, or to add words which were unnecessary for the purpose of the previous sub-section.

MR. HALDANE said that in Sub-section (2), paragraph (*b*), they were dealing with cases to which the ordinary law was to apply, and what they wanted to make sure of was that to these cases the doctrine of common employment was not applicable. They insisted that this doctrine of common employment was not to be re-enacted.

MR. C. A. CRIPPS (Gloucester, Stroud) said he thought that as regarded the first part of the sub-section the words proposed were obviously unnecessary. The question of liability had already been discussed and defined under Sub-section (2), paragraph (*b*). When they went outside that and said that an employer should be as responsible for such act and default

> "as if the workman had not been a workman of nor in the service of the employer nor engaged in his work,"

they went much beyond that sub-section as to the extent of the liability. The fact of the liability would not be altered, but the extent of the liability might be very largely increased. It seemed to him that this Amendment not only ought not to be admitted, but that the subject-matter of it had already been dealt with in Sub-section (2), paragraph (*b*).

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES argued that the Bill for the purposes of compensation under the Employers' Liability Act abolished the doctrine of common employment. But outside the Act the doctrine existed. The Amendment would therefore only be operative in the case of responsibility of employers outside the Act, in which case it would be outside the scope of the Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: If the argument of the hon. Gentleman is correct, I cannot submit the Amendment to the Committee. [*Laughter.*]

MR. McKENNA said the argument of his hon. Friend was not correct. [*Laughter.*] His Amendment did not cover the general law of employers' liability. The Committee had already decided that in regard to acts of default on the part of persons for whom the employer was responsible, a particular procedure was to be allowed; and, therefore, any Amendment which dealt with that particular mode of procedure must be relevant to the Bill.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided.—Ayes, 93; Noes, 165.—(Division List, No. 221.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved to insert at the end of the clause the following words:—

"No scheme shall be so certified which contains an obligation upon the workmen to join the scheme as a condition of their hiring."

Amendment agreed to.

MR. B. PICKARD (York, W.R., Normanton) moved to add after the words last inserted the following words:—

"or which has not been approved by three-fourths of the workmen ascertained by ballot vote."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he was afraid the Government could not agree to these words. They thought it better that the responsibility should be put upon the Registrar of Friendly Societies, especially in view of the Amendment which had just been agreed to.

*SIR C. DILKE suggested that if his hon. Friend wished to add the ballot provision, he should wait until the Report stage, and then insert the proposed words which referred to the previous Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Does the hon. Member withdraw his Amendment?

MR. PICKARD: No, Sir.

*MR. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) asked would it be competent to submit the scheme to the Registrar if only one-half of the men voted, and would that bind the other half?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said that there could hardly be a doubt that this scheme would be impracticable. In order to give effect to it they must have a clause almost as long and as complicated as a Franchise Bill. It was absolutely absurd to believe that any injustice could be done, as different precautions had been taken to obtain the opinion of the men.

MR. PICKARD asked whether the women and boys would have compensation under the Bill?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly.

MR. PICKARD said that from his experience there was no difficulty in carrying out the suggestion.

MR. FENWICK: So that boys would be entitled to ballot as well as others?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly.

MR. FENWICK did not see that it was so clear that each workman should be consulted before such a contract could be forced upon him. He should like to point out that the Bill was not sufficiently clear in that sense.

MR. S. WOODS hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would accept this proposal in its present form or some other form.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN thought the Committee might come to a decision.

*MR. J. WILSON (Durham, Mid) asked was it desirable that one-half of the workmen should overrule the other half. Would it not be better for the smooth working of the Act that they should have some arrangement whereby the question could be put to the whole of the workmen, and accepted or rejected?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said he should try to find out words, after consulting with hon. Members, which would meet the difficulty which they apprehended.

MR. BURNS said that, as the Colonial Secretary was in a concilatory mood, he would like to make a suggestion to him. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Members who had just addressed the Committee would fix upon words which would enable a ballot to be taken in circumstances advantageous to the men, but what provision was to be made for the abandonment of a scheme through, say, actuarial insolvency coming upon it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is an Amendment lower down dealing with that point.

MR. BURNS said he desired to know, before his hon. Friends and the Government entered into conference, whether the workmen would have power to refuse a scheme, even though they had previously assented to it?

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanark, Partick) said that the discussion so far had had reference only to coal mines, but it was as well to take cognisance of other industries, shipbuilding, for instance. In ship yards it would be extremely difficult to take a ballot because the men were constantly shifting from one yard to another, according to the circumstances of the work.

MR. THOMAS BUCKNILL (Surrey, Epsom) hoped the Government would not be too conciliatory. The Registrar of Friendly Societies had been chosen to act in these matters, because, having great experience and great knowledge, and being a non-party man, and absolutely free and independent, he might bring to bear on the questions brought before him a free and independent and a desirous mind to do right between employers and employed. Given that condition of things, why should they too much fetter his hands? What was the use of putting on record in this Bill that he should not allow a scheme under any circumstances, good as it might be, unless three-fourths of the workmen agreed to it? There might be a transcient difficulty, there might be a spirit reigning for the moment between employer and employed, not entirely of a pacific nature. How great must the difficulty of the Registrar of Friendly Societies be if he was bound hand and foot, and unable to approve a good scheme because three-fourths of the men had not consented to it. He hoped the Government would take the opinion of the House upon the point.

Mr. G. W. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) said that in 1893 employers had some object in trying to get the men out of the action of the Bill of that year. It was, he thought, the hon. Member for Battersea who said that no doubt the employers would contribute heavily towards the sick or accident fund, but that, very naturally, they would want somthing in return. He fancied they all knew that what they wanted in return was to keep their men out of the trades unions. [*Opposition cheers.*] He did not know whether that was a good or a bad thing, but in the works with which he was connected they had never had to any great extent any skilled men who were not trades unionists, and they had got on very well with them. [*Cheers.*] Under this Bill, contracting out was surrounded with so many conditions that it would be made so excessively expensive an operation that very few employers would attempt it. ["Hear, hear!"] He therefore did not see why hon. Gentlemen opposite should fight so tenaciously over little details. He knew nothing about coal mines, but in respect to ship yards the proposal that a scheme should be approved by three-fourths of the men was almost impracticable. The men were consistently shifting, and a scheme approved at one time might be rejected at the end of six months. Considering that the Amendment had really never been acted upon, they might safely pass on to the discussion of some other point. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. PICKARD thanked the Colonial Secretary for the courteous manner in which he had met the proposal, and asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. [*Cries of* 'No, no!"]

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 110; Noes, 189.—(Division List, No. 222.)

*Mr. J. A. PEASE moved to insert after the words last added the following words:—

"and no scheme shall be so certified by the Registrar of Friendly Societies unless he is satisfied as to its financial position as ascertained by actuarial examination."

He said it was conceivable that the workmen might themselves be contributors for some months or even some years to a scheme of which a preponderating amount might be contributed by the employers. It would be very unfair to the workmen, therefore, if on a sudden they found all their contributions cast to the wind and they were deprived of all benefits because the scheme was financially unsound. To put a case. A disaster might occur, and the workmen suffering by the accident would be unable, owing to the unsatisfactory financial position of the scheme, to obtain any compensation, or, at any rate, any compensation in accordance with the amount the arbitrator would give them under the Bill. But that there should be any necessity for moving Amendments of this kind was only another indication that the State rather than the employer ought to be made responsible. The workmen ought to be guaranteed compensation for accidents. He did not in his Amendment propose that any guarantee of absolute solvency should be inserted, but he did feel strongly that the Registrar of Friendly Societies ought to be satisfied in his own mind that these schemes were actuarially sound.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said the hon. Member for Belfast, who had probably as large an experience with regard to industrial occupations as anyone in the House, told the Committee just now that the provision proposed by the Government was one that would hardly ever be applied in practice; and he was cheered by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. [An HON. MEMBER: "Ironically!" *and laughter.*] Ironically! He had thought that hon. Members were sincere, and now he was told that they were ironical. On the contrary, he still believed that they were sincere. Almost every hon. Member on that side of the House had expressed the same opinion, and yet on a clause which they held would hardly ever come into operation, more hours had been spent than had been spent upon very important propositions. He really could not see what motive led hon. Members opposite to pile Amendment on Amendment on a clause which they thought had no practical importance whatever. The hon. Member for Tyneside was, he thought, one of those who were rather hostile to the Bill; but he was only anxious to amend it on points of detail. He credited the hon. Member with good intentions as to the Bill, but he certainly had not taken the best way of securing the result he desired. He wanted to secure that any scheme proposed under the clause should be actuarially sound. How could that be? It was quite possible to ascertain whether the contributions would be sufficient to pay the benefits offered. But that was not the point. The real point was, Would the workmen and the employer pay their contributions? Or if the contributions settled by the scheme proved insufficient would the employer pay the deficiency? All that was matter that could not be the subject of actuarial calculation. They might have a scheme actuarially sound, but if either party declined to make their contribution, well that was a difficulty inherent in every proposition that employers should contribute or should provide for the compensation of their workmen. All they could do—and this he admitted they ought to do—was to secure that under the scheme the workman should have the same guarantee of payment that he had under the Bill; in fact, to carry out the idea expressed in the provision, that he should not be put in a worse position. Under the Bill the position of the workman was this. As long as the employer was solvent he was certain to get the amount to which he was entitled; and he thought it would be quite right to provide that under any scheme of contracting out the employer should guarantee the payment under the scheme. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped hon. Gentlemen followed him. That was to say, that the employer should take under the scheme the same liability he had under the Bill—his liability to pay his contribution. If that met the views of the hon. Gentleman, the Government would be prepared to deal with the matter when they reached the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley. He hoped that if he had satisfied the hon. Gentleman he would withdraw his Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. J. A. PEASE: Does the right hon. Gentleman accept my words?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No, I do not. I propose to carry out the only object which is a practical and feasible object in other terms, and I will state the terms I think applicable to the situation when I come to deal with it.

*MR. J. A. PEASE: On that undertaking, I agree to withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LIONEL HOLLAND (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley) moved to insert after the words last added the following words:—

> "(*b*) Any such scheme shall be deemed to be less favourable to the workmen unless it provides that the contributions to be made by the employer under the scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in his employment shall be sufficient to secure the full amount and duration of the compensation payable under this Act."

He said that of course the two sections of the Amendment stood entirely distinct. The first part, which he now moved, aimed at securing that the employer should contribute in advance, so that one employer should not stand in a better position than another, but that every employer who had induced his men to contract out should contribute what would have been the full amount of his liability under the Act. As to the second part of the Amendment, he should hope that the purpose of that Amendment, even if the words had to be different, might be accepted by the Government, as its object was merely to safeguard the workmen in the event of the contribution by the employer falling short of the amount which he should pay.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL did not think his hon. Friend was present at an earlier part of the evening when they had a short discussion on an Amendment which practically raised the same point. The Amendment of the hon. Member proposed that there should be some separate calculation of the scheme under Subsection (4) as to the amount contributed by the employer so as to see that it was sufficient to secure the full amount and duration of the compensation payable under the Act. He would point out that that would be a calculation it might not be possible to enter into in regard to a scheme. It was quite impossible to say that in all schemes the amount paid by the master should be calculated solely with reference to the amount of compensation payable under the Act. He would again remind the Committee that the duty was thrown upon the Registrar of coming to the conclusion that the pecuniary benefits which a workman would get under a scheme were at least as good as those given by the Act, and, therefore, by an Instruction to tell the Registrar he must make a separate calculation to see that the contributions were sufficient to secure the full amount and duration of the compensation payable under the Act, would be to prevent his taking into consideration as he ought to do other pecuniary benefits which might be given to the workmen, and for which the master would have to begin his contribution at the same time, possibly, as the workmen began theirs. He did not think the Amendment would at all add to the security of the workmen, while it might tend to direct the mind of the Registrar to calculations which might be inapplicable to the circumstances of the case.

MR. HOLLAND asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HOLLAND moved to insert after the words last added the following words:—

> "If the contributions of the employer, as fixed by the scheme, shall prove in any event to be insufficient to meet any claim or claims to the full compensation payable under this Act, the deficiency may be recoverable from the employer under the provisions of this Act."

MR. CHAMBERLAIN was not quite certain whether he understood what the intention of his hon. Friend was in moving this Amendment. It stated:—

> "If the contributions of the employer, as fixed by the scheme, shall prove in any event to be insufficient to meet any claim or claims—"

But the principle of the scheme was that it should be a joint contribution of employer and workman, and, therefore, if there was any deficiency it might be because the contribution of the workman was too small, or that of the employer was too small. The employer had to make a contribution under the scheme which would be equal to the one he would have to provide if he came under the provisions of the Bill, and under those circumstances it would clearly be unfair to make him liable for a larger amount. What, undoubtedly, the Government wanted to secure and what he understood hon. Gentlemen opposite desired to secure was that under no circumstances should the employer under a scheme get out for less than he would have had to pay if he had not been in the scheme. That, he thought, was perfectly right and fair, and he believed that intention was carried out by the clause as it stood. If, however, his hon. Friend thought it insufficiently provided for, then he had to say that he did not think the Amendment which had been moved exactly met the difficulty. The following words would make the matter clear:—

> "If the funds under any such scheme are not sufficient to meet the compensation payable thereout, the employer shall be liable to make good the amount of compensation which would be payable under this Act."

MR. PARKER SMITH hoped the Government would not adhere to the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary, because it would knock on the head the possibility of any contracting-out scheme. [*Opposition cheers.*] The whole principle of any contracting-out scheme was that a bargain was made beforehand before the circumstances had taken place out of which one side or the other might possibly gain. The whole object of the employer in entering into an alternative scheme of the kind would be that his liability might be known and determined by giving a certain contribution as large as what was actuarially probable he would have to pay if he had not made a contracting-out scheme.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said the Amendment would not have the effect his hon. Friend supposed. It provided that where the workman did not get compensation provided by the scheme, or if the scheme provided for certain accidents or certain cases lesser compensation than the Bill, but the scheme was, on the whole, recognised as a better scheme; provided the amount contracted for was paid, the scheme would be substituted. In fact, if employer and workman mutually contracted out of the Bill for a definite object, as long as that object was observed there was no alternative. But if the employer entered into a pledge that certain compensation should be provided for the workman, it would be perfectly fair to say, "Your scheme has failed in the object you had in view, and therefore you must go back on the original Bill." That was all the Amendment intended.

Mr. PARKER SMITH accepted this explanation and regretted that he had misunderstood the Amendment.

Mr. CRIPPS said it did appear to him that in substance the criticism of the hon. Member was accurate, and that the result of the Amendment would be that none of those funds would survive in the future. ["Hear, hear!"] It was not a question whether the compensation payable by the employer should be under the Act or under a scheme, because one or the other, it did not affect the point. He assumed that an employer and his workmen had entered into a scheme which they considered for their common benefit. For a long period of years the workman had had the benefit of it, that was to say, each workman when an accident arose received far better terms than under the Act, and the employer had carried out his full obligations. After the workmen had had that advantage, say for 15 years or more, to turn round on the employer and throw the whole obligation upon him, if at any given time the fund was not sufficient to meet the claims made upon it, certainly did not amount to a game of "heads I win and tails you lose." ["Hear, hear!"] Surely that amounted to a case in which two parties having entered into an arrangement for their common benefit, in the ultimate result the liability was thrown upon one only. He could not imagine any plan more directly calculated to put an end to such funds than the plan proposed by the Colonial Secretary. He did not think he had misapprehended the Amendment, and it seemed to him that if his view of it was accurate, the whole of this clause as to contracting out might as well be deleted. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. ASQUITH said that the argument of the hon. and learned Member was a very good argument against allowing contracting-out at all; but inasmuch as contracting-out was to be allowed, he must say that he entirely agreed with the Amendment proposed by the Colonial Secretary, the effect of which was that, in whatever way a scheme of this sort was carried out, the workman should always be secured, under any fund, the minimum compensation allowed by the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Colonel DENNY said it seemed to him that the Opposition could very well afford to sit still and smile, for this simple reason, that they objected to contracting out, and they now saw it being effectually killed. ["Hear, hear!"] If the employer was to get no benefit out of a scheme between himself and his workman, what on earth was he going to enter into it for? ["Hear, hear!"]

The ATTORNEY GENERAL thought that some hon. Members who spoke for the employers overlooked the advantages which the clause would confer upon them. The Government assumed that the employer's contribution to a substituted fund would cover the payments which he might have to make under this Bill. As a result of the system of substituted funds there would be no litigation and no trouble. The system would work automatically. The Amendment, however, was necessary in order to safeguard workmen in cases where the funds, under a substituted scheme might not be sufficient to meet the compensation payable. In such cases it was only reasonable to hold the employer liable to make good the amount of compensation which it was proposed to sanction and be most useful, inasmuch as they would be likely to promote harmony between employer and employed.

Mr. W. R. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) thought that this Amendment would effectually kill contracting out. An employer would be required to guarantee the solvency of the scheme which he had arranged, and to which he contributed. That would impose a considerable burden upon him. He was anxious to see these funds established because he believed that they would induce employers and workmen to associate together for their collective good, and such association would be a guarantee of the ultimate success of the system. He knew that the hon. Member for Battersea and the representatives of trade unions held a different view; they thought that these private benefit societies were inimical to trade unions. He supported their formation, on the other hand, because he believed them to be conducive to harmony. But if these funds were to be administered with economy it must somehow be made the workmen's interest that they should be so administered, and he feared that if the guarantee contemplated in the Amendment were to be required of the employer, the inducement to economy would disappear. When the workmen knew that they had the purse of the employer to fall back upon in any eventuality, they were not likely to act economically. The guarantee which was to be required of the employers would practically be a guarantee in favour of the workmen against the results of their own extravagance.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) was surprised that this Amendment should cause so much uneasiness. In a previous Measure the contracting out clause contained the same provision for the guarantee of the solvency of the substituted fund. That provision was accepted, and stood the test of discussion. It was desirable that the employer should have the strongest possible interest in maintaining the financial stability of the substituted fund.

Mr. J. M. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland) thought that the Government had behaved with extreme fairness and impartiality. [*Ironical Ministerial cheers.*] The Government was anxious that the workman should not suffer more than was necessary through the introduction of this subsection; and in the words suggested by the Colonial Secretary the Government had done their best to minimise the effect of it. His regret was that so much time had been wasted on the consideration of the sub-section, which to all intents and purposes would result in no substantial or important effect either one way or the other.

Mr. G. WHITELEY urged the Government, in view of the attitude of hon. Members on the Opposition side, to make no further concessions on this clause, because it was evident that the appetite was growing on what it fed. [*Ironical laughter.*] He could not agree with the view that this clause would kill contracting out. He believed that in some form or another there would be contracting out to some extent, even after the clause had passed in its present shape. The workman had ample security. The schemes formulated between workmen and employers had to be thoroughly sifted by the Registrar, and if this gentleman did his duty he would turn his special attention to the financial and actuarial side of the question.

Mr. SETON-KARR was disposed to look on the Amendment as another nail in the coffin of the friendly societies. [*Laughter.*] Judging from the ominous silence of hon. Members opposite, he felt that they also took that view. Nothing, in his judgment, should be done to injure the friendly societies, but here the employer was being asked to guarantee the solvency of other persons over whom he might have no control. If there was anybody on the Treasury Bench who could carry conviction to his mind, it was the Attorney General, but even the hon. and learned Gentleman failed to convince him. Why should they make the employer responsible, not only for his own payment, but also for the possible non-payment of other people in the future? It seemed to him that to impose the obligation involved in the words of the Colonial Secretary they would take away the last possible shred of chance of any person consenting to go into any of these friendly society schemes.

*Sir C. DILKE thought hon. Gentlemen opposite had an undue apprehension in regard to the existence of the great railway societies. He was as strongly opposed to their existence as any one on his side could possibly be, but he was sorry to say that their existence was not likely to be affected by what was being done to-night. The great societies which they had in their mind were mainly the railway societies. They would be destroyed by this Bill. But they would be re-constituted as societies for old-age pensions and for other purposes. He was certain these societies would not be prevented by the Amendment from coming into existence in that way. In regard to the words proposed to be inserted by the Colonial Secretary, he was sure they were necessary. One of the great railway societies was insolvent at this moment. Of course, the railway company was solvent, but it was debarred by statutory conditions from using its funds to aid this particular society. Although he believed the great railway societies would cease to exist, they would again come into being in a new form.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY moved, after the words last inserted, to add the words:—

"The Registrar of Friendly Societies shall in every year make a report of his proceedings under this Act, and that report shall be laid before Parliament."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir J. JOICEY moved, after the words last inserted, to add the following words:—

"It shall be lawful for the employer at any time to substitute for his liability under this Act the engagement or guarantee of any insurance corporation or association previously approved by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and on such Secretary of State certifying that he is satisfied as to the sufficiency of the engagement or guarantee of such corporation or association, and that it has undertaken the liability of the employer, any liability of the employer under this Act so undertaken shall thereupon cease."

He said that the provision would be of mutual advantage to the workmen and the employers. In districts where both had organisations, joint insurance would be substituted for individual responsibility and thus the security of the workmen would be increased. But he realised that it was useless to ask the Committee to agree to anything which would be of use to the employers. The present temper of the Committee was to put every burden on the employer that was possible. He knew numbers of employers who would be affected by the Act to whom he would not give credit for £100 for a month. [*Laughter.*] This showed the necessity for his Amendment.

*Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said the proposal was that the State should become the guarantor of the insurance companies to whom the employers might resort to meet their liabilities under the Bill. The Government could not accept such an Amendment.

Mr. PERKS said there was no such proposal in the Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"] The declaration of the Home Secretary seemed to him to be one of the most serious which the right hon. Gentleman made in the course of the discussions. One of the difficulties created by the Measure was that annuities or pensions might be created on an employer's estate which would render it absolutely impossible for that estate to be wound up by the executors after the death of the employer. That was a very serious matter; while, on the other hand, it could not be in the slightest degree a disadvantage to the family of an injured workman or to the workman himself if, on the death of the employer, there could be substituted, at the request of the executors the covenant of some substantial insurance company for the pension or annuity. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. SETON-KARR thought the Amendment was one which the Home Secretary should have accepted, for it seemed to him to be perfectly innocent, harmless, and friendly to the Bill. It was partly in the interest of the employer and very largely in the interest of the men. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] The provision of a guarantee against the insolvency of an employer must surely be in the interests of the men. He maintained that the objection of the Home Secretary was not sound. A number of small employers, if they were not allowed to transfer their liability in this very satisfactory way, might be called upon to pay a large amount, which would render them insolvent.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN confessed that at first he could not see what the object of the Amendment was, and he thought in its present form it was altogether unacceptable. Although he did not know that it actually amounted to a guarantee, yet it did call on the Secretary of State for the first time to give an engagement or a certificate which assumed the solvency of a private institution. That had not been done with regard to friendly societies; it would be a new precedent, and he thought a dangerous one. But he could understand that there was some substance in the Amendment in this respect—that if the Bill remained in its present form, with continuing liabilities, it would involve very considerable difficulties in winding up estates. That appeared to him to be a serious difficulty which the Government ought to take into consideration. He suggested that if the Amendment were withdrawn some alterations would probably be made in the schedule for compensation which might remove the difficulty; but, if not, they would consider before the Report stage in what way the difficulty might be met.

Sir J. JOICEY said he had been rather alarmed at the answer given by the Home Secretary. It was quite evident that the right hon. Gentleman did not really appreciate the importance of the matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said his right hon. Friend had not understood the Amendment as it was drafted.

Sir J. JOICEY said that after the assurance which had been given, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. J. W. LOGAN (Leicester, Harborough) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would bear in mind that many of them on that side of the House who supported this Bill did so because they believed that in throwing the responsibility on the employers it would make them take greater care than they did at present.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till Monday next.

BERRIEW SCHOOL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Third Reading [24th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

PRISONS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POLICE (PROPERTY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POOR LAW BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POST OFFICE (SITES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

FINANCE BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

SCHOOL BOARDS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Monday next.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Monday next.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L].

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

POOR LAW FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

COUNTY SECRETARIES SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday 29th June.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 25th June.

BAKEHOUSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

BOROUGH FUNDS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

CANALS PROTECTION (LONDON) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

COTTAGE HOMES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

MIDWIVES' REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned till Monday next.

DISTRICT COUNCILS (WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (IRELAND) REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 4th June.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till Tuesday next.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till Monday next.

COTTON CLOTH AND OTHER FACTORIES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

LABOUR BUREAUX BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

PARISH REGISTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

MOTION.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT (NO. 2).

Bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Provand, Mr. Lowles, Mr. Martin, Mr. Strauss, Mr. David Thomas, Mr. Ascroft, Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Holland; presented accordingly, and Read the First time; to be Read a Second time upon Monday 7th June, and to be printed.—[Bill 272.]

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes after Twelve o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 28th May 1897.

EXCISE LICENCES BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading (which stands appointed for Tuesday next) put off to Thursday next.

FINANCE ACTS (WORKS OF ART).

*EARL STANHOPE rose to move:—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should take such steps to amend the Finance Acts of 1894 and 1896 as may be necessary to preserve in the country 'such pictures, prints, books, MSS., works of art, and scientific collections, not yielding income, as are of national, scientific, or historic interest.'"

He urged that steps ought to be taken without delay to determine the manner in which Clause 20 of the Finance Act of last year should be administered. Before Easter he had asked the Lord Privy Seal a Question upon the subject, and the noble Lord was unable to give him a satisfactory reply on behalf of the Treasury. The noble Lord said:—

> "The Treasury will be disposed to interpret the clause with due liberality, after taking the advice of experts in such matters, and in process of time a series of precedents must necessarily be accumulated which will be of practical importance in guiding future decisions."

He would point out that if they were to wait for these precedents many pictures of importance and interest might probably, meanwhile, go out of the country, and it would then be too late to rescue them. Clause 20 read as follows:—

> "Where any property passing on the death of a deceased person consists of such pictures, prints, books, manuscripts, works of art, scientific collections, or other things not yielding income appear to the Treasury to be of national, scientific, or historic interest, and is settled so as to be enjoyed in kind of succession by different persons, such property shall not, on the death of such deceased person, be aggregated with other property, but shall form an estate by itself, and while enjoyed in kind by a person not competent to dispose of the same be exempt from estate duty; but if it is sold or is in possession of some person who is then competent to dispose of the same shall become liable for estate duty."

The expression "not yielding income" had led a great many people to suppose that pictures and books, MSS. etc., which were left as heirlooms and which were merely held by a tenant for life would be exempt from estate duty. But the section had not been interpreted by the Treasury in that way. In one case a noble Lord had added a codicil to his will in order to make his valuable pictures heirlooms; they were nevertheless not held exempt from duty. In another case an owner asked to have his pictures scheduled and to be allowed to pay the duty on them during his lifetime, but the application was refused. In administering the clause to which he had referred, the Treasury, he believed, consulted the President of the National Gallery, but that gentleman could not be ubiquitous, and supposing several possessors of art treasures were to die at the same time, how could he be expected to value their collections and to ascertain their historic or national interest? Such a system of administration must break down. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose disposition officially was naturally grasping—[*laughter*]—had said that pictures must be something more than artistic in order to escape duty. The right hon. Gentleman's words were:—

> "Works of art were not excluded from operation of the clause, but they must be of national or historic interest."

What was to become of their Sir Joshuas and of their old Italian masters if the clause was to be interpreted in this rigid way? His objection to the clause thus interpreted was that it had led and would lead in the future to the sale of many pictures and to the dispersion of collections which it was desirable to keep in this country. It would also discourage the purchase of pictures by connoisseurs in the United Kingdom. That pictures should merely change hands did not matter to the public, but it did affect their interests when good pictures left the country to go to the United States or elsewhere. It should be remembered that many of the existing collections were accessible to the public, and that the privilege was highly valued. He did not suggest the adoption of the Italian law, which made it illegal to sell collections of pictures of national and historic interest, but he did say that something ought to be done to encourage owners of works of art to retain possession of them. It was difficult to obtain any definite information as to the number of pictures that were leaving the country, because many of them were not sold at public auctions. Only the other day a famous Holbein was sold at Christie's, and afterwards purchased from Messrs. Colnaghi by M. Bodé, the representative of the great collection at Berlin. Foreign collectors and dealers were very vigilant, and were always ready to buy pictures. They had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there were two test cases before the Treasury. Those cases were, he believed, the Rufford and the Cobham cases. It was said in the Rufford case that the Death Duties amounted to £100,000, and he supposed that the tapestries and pictures in that historic house would have to be sold in order to pay this large amount. With regard to Cobham Hall, he had received a petition from the Mayor and Corporation of Gravesend, in which they expressed the fear that under the operation of Clause 20 of the Finance Act of 1896 the pictures which had been accessible to the public every week by the courtesy of the Earls of Darnley, eventually might have to be sold and dispersed. The pictures at Cobham formed a very valuable collection, and by the kindness of Sir Henry Longley, one of the executors, he was permitted to quote from a letter of April 12, which he had received, as follows:—

> "We executors claimed to have the collection as a whole exempted, and, I think, with reason, when one looks at the working of the Act of 1896. The three collections of portraits at Cobham, viz.—(1) a collection of Stuart family portraits, 17th century; (2) a similar Bligh collection 18th century (Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Hoppner); and (3) miscellaneous collection of Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits of statesmen, poets, men of letters—are one and all of special historical interest as a series, the first and last being of additional interest as being in a Stuart house. The great collection of Italian and Dutch pictures is much of the same interest as other similar collections, and have, in many cases, their own interest and function as connecting links in the history of Art."

A wider interest was involved than that of a merely class or personal interest, and it was not a Party question. In the other House, hon. Members took a large and liberal view of this question, and an advanced Radical like Mr. Birrell—

> "thought the introduction of the word artistic was rational, and that they ought not to confine the clause merely to things connected with a place or ancestors, but ought to try and preserve in the country works of the kind referred to, because they were of interest to the nation at large."

Sir William Harcourt, on July 8, 1896, said:—

> "If it were found possible in future to make a net to let the small fishes through and to retain the large fishes, he should not object very much to such a proposal."

But the Government were making a net which would destroy all the small fishes and drive the large fishes into other waters. For this reason he thought that some notice ought to be taken of the rule laid down as to the administration of this clause. They were grateful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the concession made in Clause 20 last Session, but it did not mean very much. It was calculated to be a relaxation of less than £100,000 a year at the outside. He called attention to the unwisdom of doing anything which would cause the dispersal of historic collections like those at Knowle, Woburn, Petworth, Grosvenor House, Bridgwater House, and Stafford House, and stated that his remedy was a very simple one. He wished to have a permanent consultative Committee appointed to advise the Treasury. It ought to consist of the President of the National Gallery, the Director of the National Portrait Gallery, and a representative of the British Museum, and, perhaps, of the Science and Art Department. The establishment of such a consultative body would save a great deal of correspondence with the Treasury, and of heartburning, and as the proposal was so reasonable, he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might be inclined to accede it. If he could obtain an expression of opinion among their Lordships, he would certainly go to a Division. Pictures, manuscripts, and scientific collections were not only very valuable, but they were a glory to the country and a source of pride to the people of England. [*Cheers.*]

THE EARL OF LEVEN AND MELVILLE said that the pictures which were in our family galleries had been to a great extent largely enjoyed by the public during many years. ["Hear, hear!"] He believed that Burlington House alone had provided thousands of pictures of the highest value and artistic merit, which had tended to raise the artistic feeling of the country, and had been otherwise of the greatest benefit. Many of the men who supplied these pictures were landlords whose incomes might have been diminished, and many of whom found it to be extremely difficult to maintain those galleries. It was generally supposed that there was no expense attached to these galleries; but the insurance of pictures of special value alone was a very heavy charge, amounting as it usually did, to 4s. 6d. per cent. This was a great consideration to a man with a gallery worth £100,000, and whose income had been reduced from £10,000 a year to £5,000 or £6,000. This man might have a family of several sons, and he could not run the risk of leaving his heirs to pay the heavy duties which might become due on the parent's death. The case of this man was aggravated by the uncertainty which existed, or, as one man remarked, "No one knows what he will have to pay until he is dead." [*Laughter.*] If an owner could send a list of pictures to the Treasury for examination he might be able to learn. It was this element of uncertainty which drove away many of the pictures which might otherwise remain in the country. The estimate which the highest authority had given him of pictures that had gone abroad since the passing of the Act of 1894 was £3,500,000. [*Cheers.*] A few days ago he met a gentleman who said that he was sending a picture abroad which was almost unique; it was considered to be about the second best picture of a very great master. When asked the reason for sending it abroad, the gentleman said:—

> "Because I am offered this large sum. I cannot expose my heir to the risk of the enormous duty he may have to pay; it is far better for me to send it away than to sell it in this country. If you sell a picture in this country, one says, 'Poor soul, he is in rather a bad way, he is selling his pictures'; but if I send them abroad no one knows anything about it, and my heirs are free."

[*Laughter.*] Was it wise, statesmanlike, or right thus to tax the men who at their own expense supplied the public with this great advantage of seeing the best pictures? He hoped that some means would be found by which an owner of pictures, libraries, and works of art should be able to know before he died what duty his heirs would have to pay. He suggested to the Government whether some system could not be adopted by which an owner might make a small ready-money payment down—say, half per cent.—to free him from all death or other duties on the pictures until they were sold. The present system was not only killing the goose that lays the golden egg; it was worse, it was sending abroad the eggs already laid.

*LORD LECONFIELD remarked that the difficulty he saw in the definition which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made was that it was extremely uncertain. Of course, any picture that describes or depicts an event of interest in the history of the nation might be said to be an historical picture, but surely the works of the great masters of the past were no less entitled in an important sense to such an appellation. Each individual picture might be described as a chronicle from which the history of the various schools of painting that had existed in Europe for a great length of time might be worked out. Such histories had been of great advantage, not only to past generations, but to the present, as they would be to the future, and, therefore, he thought those pictures ought to come under the definition of historical and receive the same remission. He was very much struck at the dinner of the Royal Academy with a remark of the noble Lord at the head of the Government, when he said it was of advantage that pictures should leave the country, because the artists of this country would be called upon to increase the supply. It was impossible that our artists could make progress in painting if they had not the examples of the great artists of the past always before them. We were said to be a nation that was not given to artistic devolpment as regards designs and patterns. There could be no better study for that than a fine picture; the colouring, everything that would lead to the making of fine designs was there.

He should be glad to see some little concession on the part of the Government in this matter. It would be to the advantage of the nation. Surely art was a thing which ought to be cultivated. It was part of the development of civilisation, and he could see no reason why impediments should be put in the way.

LORD KELVIN, as an ex-President of the Royal Society, desired to point out the great importance of the Motion of the noble Earl so far as scientific collections were concerned. It might have an exceedingly injurious effect upon scientific investigation in this country if the heavy Death Duties were charged upon apparatus for scientific research or upon natural history collections, the property of private owners. Very large sums of money had been spent on private observatories. Members of the House knew well something of what had been done in that way. A large part of the astronomical investigation in the United Kingdom had been performed by amateur astronomers, if he might use the word, who stood at the very head of scientific men in respect of knowledge and skill in scientific investigation. A large amount of money had been spent upon private observatories, on great telescopes, and on other instruments of research which would be subject to exceedingly heavy Death Duties, and the heirs of the proprietors might find it impossible to keep them. The result might be that it would be necessary to sell them; foreign purchasers might get them, and those valuable tools for scientific work might be sent out of England and leave this country so much the poorer in respect of scientific work. The same might also be said of natural history collections. Such collections were of unique value. A man might spend his whole life in the work of making such collections and leave something that was of priceless value in reality and which would be estimated at a very high money figure if the expense involved in creating the collection was to be taken into account. It would be most disastrous that such natural history collections or apparatus for scientific investigation should be subjected to the severe Death Duties that were charged on those to whom was left property which they could use, and which might be sources of income and revenue to the inheritors, when that which was inherited could only be of use through the inheritor devoting himself, as the creator of the collection had devoted himself, to the public good and for the advancement of science. He thought it would be exceedingly bad and in every way undesirable that a duty anything more than merely nominal should be charged in such cases. ["Hear, hear!"]

THE EARL OF CRAWFORD said the treasure house of England was the stalking horse of the foreign dealer at the present time. ["Hear, hear!"] Europe had been ransacked. Spain, Italy, France, and other countries of the Continent contained but a small amount of art treasure, of books, and of manuscripts compared to that which lay in private hands in England. There was greater wealth in this country than in any other in private hands. These dealers, these seekers to purchase objects of beauty and of value, hailed these Death Duties with delight, because they felt that it was certain that in course of time these objects would fall into their possession. He should suggest that all such objects should not be taxed at all. ["Hear, hear!"] All such objects being of a quality that produce no interest or return to their owners—which were a constant source of outlay, whether in the way of keeping them in due order or in premiums to the insurance offices in order to guard aganst the risks of fire or theft—should be left in the safe custody of their owners, without the necessity of their being compelled to sell them owing to the infliction of these terrible duties. There was another way in which the matter might be looked at. When a man died and his executors had to prove his will they had to examine and see what were his assets. Now it frequently happened that in a man's strong box lay the record of a purchase, an investment in a business, in which the money was practically lying idle. That investment at the present moment was valued for probate as lying idle and was returned as nothing whatever. His pictures, his books, his manuscripts lying on his walls and shelves were returned as paying nothing, and yet they were to be taxed according to their utmost value. Again, it was very difficult indeed to say what, in the clause of the Finance Act, was of "national importance" or of "historical interest." Of historical importance, of course, might be said to be a picture which portrays a great event, or it might be a manuscript in the hand of a great man, dealing with a subject which was of great interest to the nation; but he would venture to say that there were pictures which ought not to leave this country which were not necessarily of historical interest. The collection which was made by the late Lord Hertford was not, in a sense, of historical interest to England, and therefore, technically, would not fall within the lines of exemption. Any one might by judicious selection make magnificent collections from the Academy and other galleries—collections which would be worthy of the nation and its art. Such pictures ought not to place a huge burden on the unfortunate heir of the collector, whose ordinary income might, from depression in trade, be greatly reduced at the moment, and who might have no option but to sell the pictures to pay the debt. Allusion had been made to a certain law in Italy, applying to certain districts, which provided that where any collection of pictures or statuary had been thrown open to the public—such, for instance, as the Villa Borghese at Rome—the owner had only a limited interest in the collection, and it could not be dispersed. He did not wish such a law to be enforced in this country, but it had the advantage of keeping pictures in the country, whereas the Finance Act had the very opposite effect. He knew of a case in which a man inherited a large property, consisting of landed estates, commercial interests, a fair collection of pictures, and a large library with many valuable MSS. He also inherited large liabilities in the shape of settlements and mortgages. The commercial interests were of a fluctuating nature; so much so that at one time they produced an income of £160,000, and within a few years not more than £5,000. Certain mortgages were called in at short notice, and the only available asset was the library, and a certain proportion of the books and MSS. had to be sold. Naturally, too, that had to be sold for which there was a demand. He urged that such possessions should be allowed to pass free, for when heavy duties were imposed it became incumbent on the possessor to look to the future and think of his successors. In the case he had alluded to, the person who inherited the books and pictures also inherited his father's love for them, and he who would next inherit them had the same passion for them. There were, therefore, three generations who had done or would do their best to maintain the value of this collection, which had always been freely placed at the disposal of those interested. The MSS. and books were sent all over Europe; at present some were on their way to the Imperial Government of Austria, and others would shortly go to the Imperial Government of Germany. He hoped an appeal would be made which would result in freeing these objects from liabilities which must end in their dispersal, and he could only add that the case which he had mentioned was his own. [*Cheers.*]

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said that there were many works of art which had not a national or historic importance, and which could not be left exposed to the operation of the Finance Act without a great restriction being put upon the collection. The noble Marquess at the head of the Government must be rather indifferent to the old masters, for speaking at the last Academy banquet, the noble Marquess said:—

> "I have seen complaints that the old masters are leaving this country rapidly, and that, under the pressure of financial difficulty and severe Chancellors of the Exchequer, the numbers of these artistic treasures which we used to possess are diminishing rapidly. So you see, at all events, that will not be a matter of profound regret, for if the old masters are leaving us, we must always remember that you are at the head of a manufactory of new masters."

The noble Marquess went on to hold out hopes of "undeveloped Raphaels and unsuspected Rubenses" in the society which he was addressing—an idea suggested rather by that of mute, inglorious Miltons than by the pictures exhibited this year, for by common consent the exhibition this year was the worst that had been held for many years. The noble Marquess also praised the liberality of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his freehandedness. This freehandedness resembled that of Robin Hood, who plundered the rich to give some portion as alms to the poor. It was easy to be lieberal to a new collection, when an exhorbitant fine was levied on every Sir Joshua and Gainsborough at the death of its owner. The value of pictures more than of anything else, was a matter of opinion. The Succession Duty Office employed a gentleman called Rossetti to visit and estimate the value of pictures, the object being, if possible, to raise the aggregate amount so that duty could be charged on the higher scale.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Viscount CROSS): I am sure that every Member of the House will be grateful to the noble Lord for bringing forward this Motion, because the matter is of the greatest importance to the country. ["Hear, hear!"] But I do not follow the noble Lord in the terms of the Motion. It is hardly possible for Her Majesty to take any steps beyond the Act of Parliament. Her Majesty could not pass an Act of Parliament, and the Motion ought to point to the action of the Treasury under the Act of Parliament, or to request the Government to amend the Act if necessary. Although I entirely sympathise with everything the noble Lord has said, the Motion is in its terms hardly one which it would be safe to pass. If the terms were altered it might be another matter. A great deal which has been said in this Debate has been really directed against the Act of 1894 and not the Act of 1896. The former Act imposed the Death Duties, and under that Act there might have been great hardship in respect of works of art. But the Act of 1896 was passed to remedy the former Act, to a great extent at all events:—

> "Where any property passing on the death of a deceased person consists of such pictures, books, prints, MSS., works of art, scientific collections, and other things not yielding income as appear to the Treasury to be of national, scientific, or historic interest."

The question was one of administration or of still further amending the present law. If under the present statute these works of art cannot be kept in the country, then let us alter the statute. But if, on the other hand, by way of administration, the Treasury can do more than they have hitherto done, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the views he holds on the matter, will only be too ready to fall in with the views of the noble Lord so far as he can do so under the Act. When I was asked a question on this subject last Session the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not feel able to lay down any special rule. He said he must see how the Act would work before he could tie the hands of his successors. Further consideration of the matter has led the Chancellor of the Exchequer to lay down certain instructions, which were given to the Inland Revenue. Those instructions are:—

> "Gentlemen,—The Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have had before them your reports, dated respectively the 8th and 15th ult., on applications that certain pictures and works of art bequeathed as heirlooms by the late Mr. R. Wilbraham and by the late Earl of Darnley, may be exempted from estate duty under the provisions of Section 20 of the Finance Act of 1896.
>
> "My Lords consider that this exemption was intended to apply not to collections as a whole but to particular works of art, which are of such national or historic interest that they would be purchased or accepted as a bequest by one of the national collections, and they agree with the suggestion that, before reporting to the Treasury that any particular works of art fall within this definition, you should cause them to be examined by an expert appointed by you, and that you should invite the opinion of the Trustees of the National Gallery or of the National Portrait Gallery on his report, according as the works are represented to be of national or of historic interest. The cost of the expert's inspection should be borne by the executors of the testator's will, and the same rule should apply if the trustees of either gallery find it necessary to send someone to look at the works on their behalf before endorsing the opinion of your expert. In deciding the question whether a picture or series of pictures are of historic interest, my Lords consider that the term may properly be held to cover pictures which, though of moderate artistic merit, directly illustrate the history of a county or of a county family of historical importance. Their Lordships agree with your suggestion that, pending the decision of the Treasury on the question whether the whole or any part of a bequest falls within the exemption of Section 20, the executors should proceed with the valuation of the estate, excluding the works of art which are in question, for consideration later on, but entirely without prejudice. I am further to return to you the letters and enclosures from Messrs. Rowcliffe and Rawle, and from Messrs. Thorold Brodie and Co., and I am to add that those firms have been informed of the instructions now given, and have been requested to place themselves in communication with your board on the subject."

The noble Earl will see that there was a great desire on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to deal fairly with this matter. I am certain that anything he can do within the terms of the Act of Parliament will be done by him to keep those works of art, whether they be pictures, manuscripts, scientific collections, or scientific instruments, in the country. I hope, therefore, my noble Friend will not press his Motion, but will rest content with the general expression of opinion on the subject which he has elicited from all sides of the House and rely upon the assurance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he will give as extended an interpretation of the Act as it is possible to give it.

*EARL STANHOPE said the answer of the Lord Privy Seal was in a great measure satisfactory, but he would like to obtain the opinion of the House on his Motion. They had been told that if they had grievances they ought to air them. [*Laughter.*] Well, here was a real grievance. He therefore begged to move his Motion in a slightly altered form:—

> "That Her Majesty's Government should be invited to take such further steps as are necessary under the Finance Act 1894-96, to preserve in the country 'such pictures, prints, books, manuscripts, works of art, and scientific collections, not yielding income, as are of national, scientific, or historic interest.'"

VISCOUNT CROSS said he really thought the noble Earl might leave the matter in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and if his noble Friend found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not carry out everything he (Viscount Cross) had said he could again bring forward his Motion.

VISCOUNT CLIFDEN: Yes, but meanwhile Rome is burning. [*Laughter.*] The noble Lord says we should trust the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Not where it is a matter of taxation. [*Laughter.*] I hope my noble Friend will press his Motion in its amended form.

Resolved in the negative.

CHURCH PATRONAGE TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Considered in Committee (according to Order); reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN asked the Government whether there was any objection to including in the annual Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings and of the proceedings of the Commissioners under the Light Railways Act, (1) a Return of the cost to the promoters of each light railway scheme, in a schedule showing how much of the said cost was incurred in payments to agents, counsel, witnesses, and otherwise; and (2) a statement of the number of opponents who made appearance at the local inquiry against each opposed scheme, and whether they were represented by counsel or agents. There was great difference of opinion as to the relative cost of these proceedings, and therefore such a Return would be of great public use.

VISCOUNT CROSS said he was requested to state that the information asked for in the second part of the Question would be included in the annual Report referred to. The Board of Trade, however, had no power to obtain the particulars of cost mentioned in the first part of the Question except in cases—none of which had yet arisen—where the local authorities were the sole promoters. They could not give those Returns, therefore, because they had not got them.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said he understood from the Light Railway Commissioners that it would be at all events easy to ask the promoters to give such Returns.

VISCOUNT CROSS did not think there would be any objection to ask for them, but they could not promise to get them. [*Laughter.*] It was undesirable to promise Returns which the Board of Trade had no power to obtain, and for the accuracy of which they could not be made responsible.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said if they could not get a loaf they must be content with half. If these Returns were asked for, he thought that would effect his object.

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

Question proposed "That the Report of Amendments to this Bill be received."

Clause 3,—

EXTENT OF ACT.

This Act shall not apply to Scotland or Ireland.

Lord COLERIDGE moved to leave out the words "or Ireland," and said it was the desire of both sides that he should do so.

The LORD CHANCELLOR of IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE) said his attention had not been directed to the matter, and he did not know what the opinion was in regard to it. He would, however, consider it.

Lord COLERIDGE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment so that he might bring it up on the Third Reading.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be Read 3ª on Monday next.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

On the Motion "That the Bill be Reported without Amendment,"

The LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): On the Debate on the Second Reading my noble Friend opposite, Lord Kimberley, expressed some apprehension that one effect of the Bill might be to induce the local authorities unduly to lower the assessment. I have made some inquiry into that matter, and I do not think there is any real ground for my noble Friend's apprehension. In the first place, it is one of the duties of the Income Tax Commissioners, and one which I am informed they very carefully discharge, to prevent any such action on the part of the local authorities, and to do all they can to prevent it. Another reason is that the Education Rate is only one of a great many rates, and in most cases only a very small fraction of the whole amount of the local expenditure; therefore the local assessment committee would have very little object in unduly lowering the valuation, because such a proceeding on their part would apparently raise very greatly the amount of all the other rates which it was their duty to levy. I do not, therefore, think there is much foundation for the apprehension my noble Friend expressed.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I am afraid I cannot accept that explanation as in any way meeting the case. I must point out, in the first place, that the Income Tax Commissioners have no power whatever over the assessment except as regards the income tax. In the second place, there really is no force in the argument which my noble Friend used, because it is perfectly indifferent to the ratepayers in any given district whether the assessment is high or low, because if it is equally distributed between one property and another as a fair assessment the amount between them will be exactly the same thing. I did not mean to imply that it was likely to be done to a large extent, but it is possible that it may occur.

Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be Read 3ª on Monday next.

MERSEY CHANNELS BILL.

Considered in Committee (according to Order); reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

LAND LEGISLATION (IRELAND).

Order of the Day read for resuming the Debate on the Motion to resolve—

1st. That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when, in the interests of justice, some compensation should be granted to landowners for the rights of which they have been deprived by the State;

2ndly. That some relief might equitably be afforded to landowners by granting State loans on same terms as those given to land occupiers, to facilitate the purchase by the landlord of the tenant-right or goodwill of the occupier where he is willing to sell such interest, or for any other purposes sanctioned by Parliament—

*LORD CLONBROCK moved "That the Debate be further adjourned until after the Whitsun Recess."

VISCOUNT CLIFDEN said he knew it was no use opposing this Motion, although he was opposed to it in spirit. To put the matter off until after Whitsuntide meant to put it off until next year. They had got the Government "on toast" for once, and if they chose to neglect the opportunity he was afraid they did not deserve another. If he might use a vulgar expression he should say the wild Irish had been "got at."

Motion agreed to.

MARKET GARDENERS' COMPENSATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read 1ª; and to be printed.—[No. 101.]

House Adjourned at Six o'Clock, to Monday next, a Quarter before Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 28th May 1897.

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (IRELAND) REGISTRATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Friday next till Monday 14th June.

QUESTIONS.

ALIEN IMMIGRATION.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in the past 40 months 104,656 Foreigners, besides over 30,000 Foreign seamen, have arrived at eastern ports in Great Britain from Europe, not *en route* for other countries, and mainly as deck or third-class passengers, and that upwards of 35,000 were Russians and Poles, three-fourths of whom came to London; that in 1896 no less than 8,000 of these destitute alien classes settled in this country; and, in such case, if he will endeavour to deal effectively with this Foreign accession to the overcrowded labour market early next Session?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): My attention has been drawn to the number of alien immigrants arriving in this country, and "not stated to be *en route* for other countries," and I have no doubt that the figures quoted are substantially accurate. The subject will continue to receive my careful consideration, but I am not in a position to make any promises for next Session.

CLEANING MACHINERY IN MOTION.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case at Morley, in which the ex-mayor, Alderman Scarth, charged at the instance of the Factory Inspector with a breach of the Factory Act, was fined 1s. and costs by the Borough Bench for allowing the cleaning of machinery in motion by a male young person; and whether a report can be obtained from the inspector on the circumstances of the case?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): I have received a report from the inspector upon this case. The proceedings were not for allowing the cleaning of machinery in motion, but, under the Act of 1895, for allowing a person to be between the fixed and traversing portions of a self-acting machine without the machine being stopped on the outward run. I am informed that this dangerous practice, now prohibited, has been common in the district, and trust that the publicity given to the present case will lead to its discontinuance. The amount of penalty was a matter within the discretion of the magistrates, but I understand they took into consideration the prevalence of the practice up till now, and the fact that no previous complaints had been made against the defendant.

ANNALY ESTATE (COUNTY LONGFORD.)

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the present position of the purchase proceedings on the Annaly Estate, county Longford; whether the legal difficulties have yet been overcome; are the tenants to receive the full benefit of their agreements for the coming gale; and when may they hope to have their conveyances completed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The rental for sale has been lodged with the Land Commission, and the solicitor having carriage of the sale expects to receive a proposal to purchase by the Land Commission within a fortnight. The terms of purchase include the payment by the tenants of their rents up to the gale day preceding the date of payment of the purchase money by the Land Commission. The solicitor having carriage of the sale expects that the vesting orders will be made by the end of June.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

MR. JOHN AIRD (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works (1) if Members with the ladies accompanying them, and also the Press, may be allowed to enter the Houses of Parliament on Jubilee Day by the entrance to the House of Lords; and (2) if arrangements can be made for a military band to play in Palace Yard during the morning?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Members of this House and their friends holding tickets for seats on the House of Commons stands can enter the Palace of Westminster on Jubilee Day by New Palace Yard, by St. Stephen's Porch, or by the garden entrance behind the Victoria Tower, and those desiring to come by water can approach by Speaker's Stairs. I think every needful facility will thus be afforded, and I should deprecate the use of the House of Lords entrance in consideration of the unnecessary labour it would cast on the minor officials of that House if they had to be on duty on that day. The answer to the second paragraph of my hon. Friend's Question is in the negative.

MR. M. J. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is possible, to mark this year of the Diamond Jubilee, by offering to the senior auxiliary postmen, who are too old for staff appointments, appointments as supernumerary postmen, whereby they would rise from 18s. to 26s. weekly?

*THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston). The Postmaster General regrets that it is not possible to offer appointments as supernumerary postmen to senior auxiliaries who are too old for established appointments. The class of supernumerary postmen is a temporary one, and is being gradually abolished as vacancies occur.

MR. AIRD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if his attention has been drawn to the great additional pleasure it would give to Members and their friends if the opportunity were afforded of seeing the illumination of the Fleet on the great Naval Review day; and whether he can make any arrangements in the matter?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): Negotiations are proceeding with one of the companies, whose tender for the conveyance of visitors has been accepted, with a view to affording an opportunity of seeing the illuminations to the Members of both Houses who propose to attend the Naval Review, but the extra cost of such an arrangement would have to be borne by the Members who desired to prolong their stay. [*A laugh.*]

MR. J. G. HOLBURN (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that the Local Government Board of England have recently issued general orders empowering boards of guardians to grant additional allowances to the legal poor on the occasion of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee; if he will explain the difference in the law which prevents parish councils in Scotland being similarly authorised; and whether anything can yet be done to assimilate the powers of the Poor Law authorities in both countries on the occasion in question?

Mr. H. T. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews Burghs, for The Lord Advocate): In reply to the hon. Member, I need only say that the statutes governing such matters in England and Scotland are quite dissimilar, and that it is obviously impossible to assimilate the law in time for the purpose specified in the Question.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether representatives from the Crown Colonies, as well as from Colonies possessing representative government, have been invited to attend the Diamond Jubilee celebrations together with members of the various Native races; and, if not, why this distinction has been made to the disadvantage of the Crown Colonies; and whether any official position will be assigned to the civil officers of the Ceylon Government and representative Native gentlemen visiting London?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.): The question of the representation of the Crown Colonies at the celebration of the 60th year of Her Majesty's reign has from the first received my most careful consideration. There is no one in these Colonies occupying an analogous position to that of the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies, and I have arrived at the conclusion that representation will, on the whole, be best effected by the presence in London of representative detachments of their local military forces. Invitations to this effect have accordingly been addressed to all Crown Colonies, including Ceylon, where such a representation appeared practicable, and no official position can therefore be assigned to any civil officers of the Ceylon Government or to the Native gentlemen who are about to visit London. I may add that this decision was communicated to the Governor of Ceylon, and that I learn from him that it was distinctly explained to the Native gentlemen in question before their departure.

Sir BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will consider the advisability of giving a medal in commemoration of Her Majesty's long reign to members of the Royal Naval Reserve?

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY: I do not see how I could consider the question of granting a medal in commemoration of her Majesty's reign to the Royal Naval Reserve except in conjunction with a proposal to give such a medal to all branches of Her Majesty's Naval and Military forces.

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether, in commemoration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, he will advise the release of the treason-felony prisoners still imprisoned in Irish gaols?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR; There are no treason-felony prisoners in Irish gaols.

Mr. FLAVIN; I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office, whether it is proposed, in commemoration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, to grant a special bounty to the surviving veterans of the Crimean War?

*The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.): I beg to refer the hon. Member to the answer I made yesterday to the hon. Member for Newington, to the effect that no further step in the direction indicated was at present in contemplation.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS.

Mr. D. NICOL (Argyll): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the petitions from the lighthouse keepers of the United Kingdom for an increase of pay and for prospective pensions in their service have now been considered by him, and if he can state what decision he has arrived at?

Mr. RITCHIE: The Board of Trade are now engaged in considering the recommendations of the lighthouse authorities with regard to the position of the lighthouse keepers in their service, but having regard to the varying circumstances in each case, it must be some time before a decision can be arrived at.

STATIONERY OFFICE.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any complaints have reached him from the various classes of clerks in

Her Majesty's Stationery Office as to their employment on duties of a superior nature to those specified in the regulations under which they were appointed: whether in one branch of that Department clerks of the old establishment, clerks of the second division, abstractors, and boy copyists are employed side by side on precisely similar duties; and whether considering the long period that has elapsed since the staff of this Department has been re-organised, he will consider the advisability of appointing a Departmental Committee of Inquiry?

*MR. HANBURY: No, Sir; I am not aware of such complaints by the various classes of clerks referred to. I am assured that in no branch of the Stationery Office do the several classes of clerks named work together on precisely similar duties. It is the fact that the work and the conditions in which it is done have much changed since the last rearrangement in 1879, and I have assented to a suggestion which the Controller recently made to me that the organization of his office should now be inquired into by a Departmental Committee.

AMERICAN CATTLE.

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can explain upon what principle American cattle intended for slaughter at the port of debarkation may be landed at Liverpool or Glasgow and not at Belfast; and, whether, in the interest of Irish victuallers, he will undertake to modify the rules so that foreign cattle may be landed in Belfast?

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby): The matter to which the hon. Member refers is not within my own jurisdiction but within that of the Irish Privy Council. I answered a question respecting it on the 24th July last, and I shall be happy to hand the hon. Member a copy of the reply I then made.

MR. G. W. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) asked whether it was not the fact that the Irish authorities were not averse to these cattle landing at Belfast, but that the right hon. Gentleman had frightened them by saying that if a single case of disease occurred it would stop the importation of all Irish cattle into England?

*MR. LONG: I am not prepared to reply on behalf of the Irish Department; but, as far as my action goes, all I did was to intimate to the Irish Government that if they ran the risk certain results might follow, and that if they did follow certain things would happen.

POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENTS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether he is aware that postmen are to-day being passed over for stripes for irregularities, already expiated, committed more than four years ago; and, if so, whether that portion of the Inter-departmental Report on Post Office Establishments referring to unblemished character for five years can be so modified as to insure to these postmen the issue of their stripes now due, and be not made to act retrospectively?

*MR. HANBURY: A good conduct stripe can be earned only by five years' good conduct, and the Postmaster General is not prepared to modify the regulation in the manner suggested.

POTATO CROP (LISTOWEL DISTRICT.)

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) if he is aware that the potato crop was seriously injured by heavy rains and other causes in the Listowel Union last harvest; and (2) whether, in view of the possibility of the blight setting in from the injured condition of the seed planted this year, the Guardians of the Listowel Union will be allowed to purchase a number of sprayers for the protection of the potato crop from blight?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I believe the fact is as stated in the first paragraph. As regards the second paragraph, there is no legal authority by which the Guardians are empowered to expend the rates of the Union in purchasing spraying machines for the use of occupiers of land in the various electoral divisions of the Union. I may add, however, that the Congested Districts Board proposes this year to apply a sum of £1,000 towards supplying spraying materials within the congested districts.

CIVIL SERVICE (TEMPORARY MEN COPYISTS).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the date when the present class of temporary men copyists were first advertised for by the Civil Service Commissioners in the public Press; the date of the first public examination for temporary men copyists; and the date when the first batch of successful candidates were registered by the Civil Service Commissioners?

*MR. HANBURY: The first notice of examinations being held for temporary copyists (then called writers) was issued 15th August 1870, inviting applicants to present themselves for examination on any Thursday or Friday during August or September. A large number of applicants attended accordingly for examination in the weeks ending August 20th and 27th, and on August 30th. The Commissioners passed a minute, directing that the names of 18 successful in the examinations should be registered, as the inquiries respecting age, health, and character, were completed. Names were thus registered on September 3rd, 6th, 8th, and later dates. This register of temporary men copyists was closed in December 1886 (on the issue of the Treasury Minute giving bonuses for good service and gratuities on retirement). Since then, 745 men, then serving as temporary copyists, have obtained permanent appointments in the Civil Service (as "Abstractors," or otherwise) and only 122 are now serving as temporary copyists.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that great inconvenience is caused by the early hour at which the Sunday mail train leaves Limerick for Tralee; and whether the Postmaster General will allow the railway company to change the hour of departure to a more convenient one?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is not aware that inconvenience is caused by the earliness of the hour at which the night mail train is dispatched from Limerick to Tralee on Sundays. The dispatch is made at 7.30 a.m., 2 hours 40 minutes later than on weekdays. Tralee itself is served by an earlier train from Mallow; but there is reason to believe that if the train from Limerick were made later on Sundays than at present, complaints would be received as to the later delivery of the correspondence of the towns between Limerick and Tralee. Under these circumstances, the Postmaster General does not see his way clear to agree to a later dispatch of this train on Sundays.

ROYAL CANAL HARBOUR, LONGFORD.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he can now state the result of the promised investigation of their statutes by the Midland Great Western Railway Company on the subject of the fencing of the Royal Canal Harbour at Longford; and whether the people of Longford may hope for anything being done in the matter?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: I am informed that the Midland Great Western Railway Company have been advised that they are under no legal obligation to fence the canal, nor can they legally so fence the canal as to prevent reasonable access to it, or to do any act which would obstruct its navigation. This advice cannot, of course, interfere with such legal rights as the Town Commissioners have, to put up, for the protection of the public, a fence on the township property—provided the same be not an obstruction to the navigation.

IRISH CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS.

MR. SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there is any money provided by Parliament for the publication of ancient chronicles and memorials connected with the history of Ireland; whether he is aware that there are several most valuable ancient Irish chronicles and documents still unpublished, whilst large sums have been annually granted for the publication of like documents connected with the history of England and Scotland; and whether a like provision will be made in future for the publication of ancient Irish chronicles and memorials.

*MR. HANBURY: For many years, since about 1825, provision has been made by Parliament for the publication in full of public and private documents connected with the history of Great Britain and Ireland prior to the reign of Henry VIII., forming what is known as the Rolls Series. Of these the Irish have formed a considerable proportion; and over and above these the Celtic documents have been provided for by special Parliamentary grants, while the Royal Irish Academy (who deal with them) receive, in money and housing, a subsidy of over £2,000 a year. We have received no representations as to important Irish documents still unpublished. This branch of antiquarian work is being replaced by that of calendaring official documents of public interest; but of the only two new works which have been undertaken since 1885, one is wholly, and the other mainly, Irish. Private collections of historical documents are dealt with by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, who, I observe, are at work on the Ormonde papers and on the Acts of Queen Elizabeth's Privy Council in Ireland. The right hon. and learned Member may be interested to know that we have just bought for the Irish Record Office some State papers of about two centuries back at the sale of the Phillips library. ["Hear, hear!"]

POSTAL ORDERS.

MR. G. B. HUDSON (Herts, Hitchin): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the Postal authorities refuse to pay halfpennies in postal orders although a half-penny stamp is affixed to an order, causing inconvenience to those forwarding remittances by post where an exact sum is required, such as in the payment of rates; and whether this rule can be done away with?

*MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is aware that the payment of half-pennies on postal orders is refused, and he would refer the hon. Member to the rule on the subject which appears at page 435 of the Post Office Guide. One difficulty was that many postal orders were passed through bankers and they did not pay half-pennies. In view of the inconvenience which would arise if the practice were changed, the Postmaster General regrets he is not able to do away with the rule.

ZANZIBAR.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, under the decree issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar on 6th April last, British officers have been appointed to watch the cases and to prevent injustice, in accordance with the instructions sent to Mr. Hardinge on 10th February by Lord Salisbury, in each of the district courts on the Islands of Pemba and Zanzibar; and, if so, whether such officers are carrying out this work?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MR. G. CURZON, Lancashire, Southport): In accordance with the recommendation of Her Majesty's Government, Mr. Hardinge proposed that Mr. Last, who has had large experience in the interior of the island of Zanzibar, and Archdeacon Farler, late of the Universities Mission, should be appointed for Zanzibar and Pemba respectively; and they are believed to be now engaged upon these duties.

FUGITIVE SLAVES (BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE).

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devon, Honiton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's representatives in the Coast strip of the British East Africa Protectorate have been in the habit of issuing formal documents giving to the bearers permission to proceed to given places to search for slaves, on which permits they have levied a fee; and, whether runaway slaves fetched by soldiers in British employ, as wanted by the Commissioner, with letters signed by the Commissioner, have after their surrender been taken before British Courts for proof of ownership, and, after proof, handed over to their masters?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is acquainted with the manner in which Her Majesty's Representatives administering the Coast strip of the British East Africa Protectorate over a length of 200 miles have hitherto exercised the discretion vested in them to claim or not to claim fugitive slaves; whether British subjects have been compelled to surrender fugitive slaves by the British authorities, and have in fact surrendered great numbers of such slaves; and whether the recent direction to Her Majesty's Representatives to conform to the terms of the Brussels Act will prevent such practices in future?

*MR. CURZON: Under the system which till lately prevailed in the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, legally held slaves who had run away without justification or excuse were restored to their owners. More recently the British Administrator has received instructions to exercise his discretion in each case as it occurs. The hon. Member is no doubt aware that the abolition of the legal status of slavery is confined to the insular dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar. It would not at present be possible to carry into effect such a measure on the mainland. Her Majesty's Representatives have instructions to conform to the provisions of the Brussels Act; but as I pointed out the other day, they do not apply to the majority of the cases to which allusion appears to be made in the two Questions.

DISTRESS RELIEF WORKS (CO. CAVAN).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and if so what, steps have been taken to complete the public road in the electoral divisions of Benhack and Templeport, in the Bawnboy (Co. Cavan) Union, which was commenced during the period of relief of distress works in 1894-95; whether he is aware that the sum of £50, voted by the Treasury to complete the road, had to be returned because the work could not be finished within the financial year; and whether, under all the circumstances, and seeing that the road has already cost a very large sum of money, yet is wholly useless for the want of surface metalling, he will again ask the Treasury to re-open the matter and advance the necessary amount of money to complete this useful public convenience?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous question of the 1st May 1896 on this subject, and must decline to ask the Treasury to re-open the matter.

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND).

MR. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the annual Report of the Irish Loan Fund Board for 1896 has not yet been presented to Parliament; and whether he can indicate when it will be possible for Members to obtain copies of this Report?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Report is now practically complete, and will be presented with as little delay as possible.

MULLINGAR UNION.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board last year cancelled the medicine contract in Mullingar Union, and declared the local contractor unfit to hold the contract, on account of the system of overcharging practised, the Local Government Board pointing out that the local contractor charged £70 for drugs which Messrs. Leslie, Dublin, tendered to supply for £40; whether the Local Government Board have sanctioned the action of the Guardians this year in voting the medicine contract to the same local contractor, although there were five lower tenders from competent and respectable houses in Dublin, Sligo, and Cork; and whether he can state the reasons that have induced the Local Government Board to sanction this year what they cancelled last year?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The reasons for the termination of the medicine contract last year were explained by me in answer to the hon. Member's previous question of the 26th January. Boards of Guardians are at liberty to enter into Union contracts, including the supply of medicines, without the sanction of the Local Government

Board. The Board have not expressed their sanction to this year's contract, but should it hereafter be found that overcharges are made in connection with the contract the Board would then take cognizance of the matter.

IRISH ANTIQUITIES.

MR. WILLIAM LECKY (Dublin University): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether a superintendent of the Irish Antiquities in the Science and Art Museum, Dublin, has yet been appointed; and, if not, when it is expected that such an appointment will be made; and if he can state how much of the grant in aid, amounting to £3,300, which is placed on the votes for the Dublin Science and Art Museum and National Library, it is proposed to allocate to the section of the Museum devoted to Irish antiquities, or whether the increase of the vote by a sum of £900 over the last financial year is meant to be expended on adequately displaying the Museum of Antiquities transferred from the Royal Irish Academy's house?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Committee of Council hope to be able to announce the appointment at an early date. No part of the sum of £3,300 is separately allocated to the Irish Antiquities Section. None of the grant can be spent on the structure of the Museum.

GAMBLING IN PRODUCE FUTURES.

MR. W. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he has received or asked for any reports from British Consuls stationed in the capitals of the various European nations which have legislated or are considering legislation respecting gambling in futures of produce: and, whether he will cause such inquiry to be made and reported to this House?

MR. RITCHIE: Reports have been called for from Her Majesty's Representatives in the capitals of the countries referred to, and the replies are now being received.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, DUBLIN.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it is contemplated to restore the College of Science, Dublin, to its original constitution as embodied in the Report of the Commission held in 1866; and whether, as that report was drawn up and signed by the best authorities of local requirements, including Dr. Sullivan, Sir Robert Kane, Professor Tyndall, and Lord Rosse, being amongst the experts, the proposed new college will be included amongst the institutions to be governed by local authority?

SIR JOHN GORST: The college is carried on in accordance with the Report referred to, with some slight modifications. The Report did not contemplate its being governed by local authority.

DELAGOA BAY ARBITRATION AWARD.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state when the Delagoa Bay Arbitration Award will be promulgated; and whether, seeing that eight years have passed since the claim came before the Jurists at Berne, Switzerland, he will explain the cause of the delay?

*MR. CURZON: I cannot yet say when the Award will be given. Delay has been caused by the successive applications for postponement which have been made by both parties to the arbitration, and by the necessity which had arisen for sending an expert out to report upon the Delagoa Bay Railway and other South African lines.

MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY (GREENWICH).

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether any steps have been taken to fix the site of the new Magnetic Observatory at Greenwich?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir; and a site has been selected with the concurrence of the Astronomer Royal. May I take this opportunity of stating that Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify her consent to the handing over of the Ranger's Lodge at Greenwich to the Commissioners of

Woods and Forests, and it will, in future, form part of the Hereditary Land Revenues of the Crown? That portion of Greenwich Park, some 15 acres in extent, which has hitherto formed part of the grounds annexed to the Ranger's Lodge, Her Majesty has been pleased to throw into the Royal Park for the use of the public, and I may say that it will add very materially, both in extent and otherwise, to the beauty of the park. Her Majesty's gracious act will, I am confident, be duly appreciated by the House.

ARMY REGULATIONS (ST. PATRICK'S DAY).

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if it is the intention of the authorities to issue regulations with regard to the wearing of the shamrock on St. Patrick's day by soldiers of Irish nationality in Her Majesty's Army?

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS: It is not intended to issue any regulation specially affecting the wearing of emblems by Irish soldiers.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the authorities in the coming Naval manœuvres to direct any of the Fleet to visit Tarbert Bay, on the coast of Kerry?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY: No decision has been arrived at as to the places to which Her Majesty's ships will be sent in the coming Naval Manœuvres.

RURAL POST MESSENGER (DISMISSAL).

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, what were the grounds for the dismissal of Rural Messenger Corley, of Emyvale, who discharged the duties of letter-carrier between Emyvale and Mullan for a period of four years without a single complaint having been made against him; and will employment be found for him when the staff of rural messengers is being increased?

*MR. HANBURY: It can scarcely be said that the man was dismissed. When the situation was recently converted into an established appointment, imperfect information respecting Curley was furnished, and this led to another person being selected. I have made inquiries and find that the imperfect information respecting Curley (not Corley) was owing to his being thought to be another man who had only one leg. But upon fuller information being forthcoming, steps were taken to reverse the decision, and Curley, who was placed on the duty on Monday the 24th instant, will be appointed if he can obtain the necessary Civil Service certificate.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

LORD WARKWORTH (Kensington, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is able to state what course the Government propose to take in view of the unanimous Report from the Select Committee on Museums of the Science and Art Department, with regard to the serious danger of destruction by fire to which the collections at the South Kensington Museum are exposed?

MR. T. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what steps are proposed to be taken to forthwith protect the collections at South Kensington Museum, which are described in the recent Report of the Committee as priceless, against loss or damage from fire, having regard to the Report submitted on the subject by the Select Committee on the Museums of the Science and Art Departments?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked when the authorities first became aware of the danger from fire, and whether they had continued to add to the collection thus exposed to danger?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In reference to the Question just put to me by my hon. Friend, I must ask for notice. With regard to the Questions on the Paper, I have to say that the Report is engaging the serious attention of the Government. ["Hear, hear."]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. J. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Notts, Mansfield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will give an assurance that the Education Vote will not be taken until after the Whitsuntide Recess?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he hoped the Education Vote would be taken shortly after Whitsuntide, not before, but he could give no promise as to the day.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes again to take the Army Estimates; and, if he will be so good as to arrange to resume the discussion of the Vote for the Secretary of State's salary on the Friday following Her Majesty's Commemoration, or as soon after as may be convenient?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said he thought it would be convenient to resume the discussion of the Army Estimates next week. They would not, however, take Vote 13—War Office Salaries—until after Whitsuntide, and he would give his right hon. Friend ample notice of the date when it would be taken.

MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) asked whether they were to understand that the Education Vote would not be taken in the third week in June, which week, they had been told, would be reserved for non-controversial Supply?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY could not give any pledge that they would not take the Education Vote in that week.

COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon) asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the general wish that the Committee stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill should close before the Whitsuntide recess, and to the possibility in that event of an extra holiday on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of June, it was not desirable to suspend the Twelve o'clock Rule next week?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I think it is a matter of some importance that the House should consider what steps we ought to take with the Committee stage of this Bill; not that I for a moment suggest that any undue length of time has been taken up in discussing the Bill, for I admit the discussion has been of a very businesslike character, but because, unless we succeed in finishing the Committee stage before the holidays, it will be necessary for us to meet on Monday the 14th, and go on with it then. That, I feel sure, would be very inconvenient, and I think it would be worth our while making a little extra effort next week in order to avoid that necessity. If we succeed in finishing the Committee stage before we separate for the holidays, I suggest we should not meet until Thursday, the 17th, and that then we should take up Supply. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR C. DILKE pointed out that there were several controversial points to raise on the schedule to the Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I admit that that is so. Of course, if we suspend the Twelve o'clock Rule, it will not be for the purpose of any prolonged sitting, but simply to gain an additional three-quarters of an hour or an hour. I hope the House will consider the alternative. Both alternatives undoubtedly are open to some objection, but I think the general convenience of the House would be met by a little extra sitting upon the three nights which still remain before the holidays.

MR. J. P. FARRELL asked whether it was the intention of the Government to take Irish Supply on the day of reassembling?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: No, Sir.

MR. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the promised Bill dealing with technical education in Ireland will be introduced, and what is the estimated amount of money to be disposed of under the provisions of the Measure?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: The proposals with respect to technical education which the Governmen intended to introduce were in connection with the Agriculture and Industries Bill. That Bill, as the hon. Gentleman knows, has been dropped, and of necessity, therefore, the technical education proposals dropped with it for the present Session.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.

[TENTH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

Class I.

1. £132,291, to complete the sum for Survey of the United Kingdom.

Mr. **JOHN DILLON** (Mayo, E.) called attention to the case of the Civil assistants of the Ordnance Survey, who, according to the information supplied to him, had been unfairly deprived of their rights to promotion and superannuation under certain rules introduced some 25 years ago. He believed that the rule against the Civil assistants was made by the then head of the Survey on the distinct understanding that the Survey would be completed in or about the year 1880, and that therefore it was not desirable ot take on any more assistants in that Department who could be treated as permanent Civil Servants of the Crown. This was now 1897, and the Ordnance Survey was not completed; in fact, he was informed it might go on for an indefinite number of years. Perhaps the responsible Minister would state to the Committee the view he took in regard to the claim of these men.

*Mr. **HANBURY** thought the hon. Member was under some misapprehension as to the real merits of the case. As he understood, these Civil assistants who were without pension rested their claim to pension upon two grounds. They maintained, in the first place, that when they entered the service they thought it was a pensionable service. No doubt up to the year 1870 this had been a pensionable service, but in that year Sir Henry James, who was then Director of the Survey, came to the conclusion that the survey ought to be completed in about ten years—about 1880. That being so, it was absurd to enter men who would be pensionable; and, consequently, orders were given by the Office of Works, who were then the controlling authority of the Survey, to the effect that no more men should be admitted upon pensionable terms. That Order was sent to Sir Henry James on September 29, 1870, but it was not made known to the men generally until about the end of August, 1872, when the Order was officially announced in the House, and a Parliamentary Paper was issued stating publicly the effect of the Order. The men apparently refused to treat that as an official notice, and on January 4, 1873, an official notice was issued to the men warning them as to the Order that had been given. The men who had entered the service between September 29, 1870, and January 4, 1873, contended that between those dates they had had no official intimation that they were not pensionable, and they claimed pension. In 1894 that claim was conceded. Now, however, those who entered the service since January 4, 1874, said that, although no doubt they had full notice, they were in the same position with regard to pay as the men who had entered during the two previous years, and they ought to be treated in exactly the same way. The answer was complete—namely, that they entered the service with full knowledge of their position. Then they said, "Yes, that may be true, but we are paid on the same terms as those men." That, again, was not exactly accurate, because there were two sets of men who were receiving the same wages. There were those who had received the same salary and prospective pension in addition, owing to an alleged mistake which did not exist in the case of the men who had complained; and the only other men who received the same rate of salary and pensions in addition were the men of higher position, who had been promoted to supervising and superintending posts. There was, therefore, no analogy between the two cases. Another point raised was that in 1870 this service was made a non-pensionable service, under the idea that the ordnance survey would come to an end in about ten years. That was perfectly true, but what had happened in that time? In the first place, all the men whose work was necessarily permanent were pensionable as it was. Then, again, they found that the work was quite as well, and perhaps better, done by a non-pensionable staff, where they could dismiss the men either if they were not required or their work was not quite up to the mark. According to the Report of the Committee of 1891, the number of pensionable men was 300, as compared with 1,350 who were not pensionable, and it would be perfectly ridiculous to put the whole of these 1,350 men (or whatever the present number was) when they had no special claim whatever, in exactly the same position as the pensionable men. He was bound to say that they had not very much encouragement to give pensions, because some of the trouble with regard to this staff had really arisen with the men who were pensionable already. The Committee of 1891 had gone into this case most carefully, and they reported that these men were receiving the full pay their services required, that there was a great demand to enter the service, that sons of civil assistants themselves were constantly applying to be put on the list, and that many who had left the service were constantly asking to be restored. That showed that the men were receiving adequate and full salary. The Committee also said it would be a great disadvantage to the service if these men were pensioned, because undoubtedly, in a great number of these cases, the work would be quite as well done by the Royal Engineers, and that in the case of vacancies, it would be more advantageous to the service, instead of having pensionable men, to employ Royal Engineers in their place. A further argument raised by the men was that if the Government could not pension them all, at any rate, they should pension those who had been 15 years in the service. That, of course, gave away the case of all the men who had not had 15 years' service. It was an admission that their salaries were adequate. He did not know why men with that amount of service should be treated differently to men of shorter service. They must have the whole of the men in a similar position, either pensionable or not pensionable. As a matter of fact the men who had served 15 years were already in a somewhat better position than the men who had not served that time, because on their retirement after 15 years' service they were entitled to a very considerable gratuity. Then, again, the men raised the point that they had been in continuous employment and that, therefore, they ought to be put on the pension list. The answer to that was equally plain. They had had the benefit of being in this continuous employment, a benefit which they might not have had if they had been in private service. Their case by no means differed from that of a large number of men in the employment of the Government.

SIR BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton) was sure the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would not think he was in any way contradicting him, or being at all uncivil, if he said that the account he had given of the knowledge of these men, many of whom were in his own constituency, when they joined that they were not going into a pensionable service, was perfectly different from that which they themselves gave. He could bring forward many of these temporary civil assistants who would take their oath that they joined this service believing, and having every possible good reason to believe, that they were joining a service in which they would get pensions at the age of 60 years. He had seen in Colonel Leech's own handwriting a letter in which he said that the taking of pensions off these men was not a publication, but was simply a direction to the Director of the Ordnance Survey Department, the then Sir Henry James. They were told that these boys might have found out from the Parliamentary Papers that they were joining a survey which was not pensionable, but how were these young clerks to get hold of Parliamentary Papers at the age of 14 to find out whether, when they were 60 years old they were to have a pension or not. He absolutely maintained that proper steps had not been taken, and he did not know that they had been taken at this moment, to tell these men that they were not to receive a pension. They were told that the pay was so good that pensions were absolutely unnecessary. When a man was 29 years old and had got 15 years' service he had a pay of 30s. a week. If he had 30 years' service his pay was 50s. if he had been of the best possible conduct. They had to remember that every one of these men was an educated man, and that he quite naturally wished to educate his children as well as, or better than, he had been educated himself. He maintained that it was absolutely impossible for a middle-aged man, out of 50s. a week, with children to educate and himself to keep respectable, to save money. He completely, but as politely as he could, denied the idea that the pay was sufficient to make pensions unnecessary. The right hon. Gentleman had told them—and he quite allowed that he must know—that a great many sons of these men were anxious to go into the same service as their fathers. All that he could say was that a very great many sons of these men were not anxious to go into the same service. The number of sons of men in this employment who wanted to go as clerks in the railway and said they were better treated than they would be in their father's service was perfectly annoying at times when the postbag came in in the morning. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had not been able to say anything that would have been comforting to the hearts of these people. He supposed the only thing to do was to hammer away year after year, because it was absolutely necessary that the state of these people should be kept as much as possible before Parliament. He hoped that some day the Treasury would change their minds and be a little more soft-hearted to these most deserving, but most necessitous, people.

MR. J. J. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) agreed with the Secretary to the Treasury that there was no distinction between those men who had 15 years' service, and those who had not, but he thought that the claim on behalf of these men for pensions was sustainable on another ground. The work in which these men were employed was of a peculiar and exceptional character, and required a very special training, and when they ceased to work at this employment they were absolutely useless for any other employment. He desired to press that point on the right hon. Gentleman because he had not touched it at all. He wanted to ask him this question. Were the Treasury under the circumstances, knowing that these were educated men—personally, he knew several of these men to be men of education and real gentlemen—were, the Treasury, knowing the character of these men, and knowing that after 15 or 20 years' service they would be absolutely helpless and idle, and if they had not saved money absolutely without resources—were they going, under these circumstances, to stand on the strict letter of their contract? He would admit for the moment the strength of the point made by the Secretary to the Treasury as to the men having knowledge of the fact that they were to be without pensions; though, indeed, he must say that the reply of the hon. Member for Southampton on that subject came home to him with peculiar force, because he knew, as a matter of fact, that these public notices, supposed to be given, did not come within the knowledge of the persons affected. But, admitting for the moment that these men knew on entering the service that they were entering a non-pensionable service, was it in the public interest to hold them to it? Putting the public interest aside, was it common justice to take the services of a man of special education and exceptional training, who at the end of 15 or 20 years' service, when he lost his employment, would be absolutely without resources and without the means of earning his bread—was it common justice for the Treasury to say, "Oh! we made a contract with you 20, or it may be 30, years ago; you knew you were entering an unpensionable service, and we will bind you now to the strictest terms of that contract." It would be a mean and shabby performance on the part of the Treasury of this great country, which was able to spend on one shell fired into Crete the other day, as much money as would provide pensions for the whole of these people. There was another reason why these men were entitled to generous treatment in the matter of pensions. The right hon. Gentleman had hinted at the desirability of employing Royal Engineers to do some of this work according as vacancies arose. He was informed that when vacancies had occurred, men on the temporary list, well qualified by training and character—had been passed over, and instead of appointing these men to the posts, and thereby mitigating to that extent the grievance of having no pension, they had dragged in men of the Royal Engineers, men who had been worn-out in the service, and who had a pension already, and who, in his opinion, were not fit for the work, at all events, not as fit as the persons who had been passed over.

*MR. HANBURY wished to correct the hon. Member. In 1894 there were 43 civil assistants appointed, as against 12 Royal Engineers.

MR. CLANCY said that was just his case. Why should any of these vacancies be given to the Royal Engineers? Why should they not be all given to the temporary civil assistants? It was out of the nature of things that these Royal Engineers, after long service in other parts of the world, and who were already provided for, should be as fit for the duties as men who had specially trained; and it was most unjust that they should be promoted over the heads of men who had practically spent the whole of their lives in doing the drudgery of the Department. The course pursued seemed to him to be shabby, mean, and unjust, and as long as he was in the House he should never cease to say so, until the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury or some one else representing his Department, gave way upon this question.

Mr. C. J. MONK (Gloucester) said that in spite of what had been urged, he thought the Committee would be of opinion that the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury was quite unanswerable. The appeal to justice could hardly come fairly from hon. Gentlemen opposite. He thought that justice had been fully done to the employés of the Ordnance Survey. He rose, however, for the purpose of asking how long the Survey would be continued? Parliament was informed many years ago that it would probably be concluded in 1880. Seventeen years had passed, and he should like to know if the right hon. Gentleman could give them any idea how many years more it would be prolonged. He observed that there was an increase in the estimate this year of upwards of £7,000. That increase probably arose under the head of stores. There was an increase of £2,500 for maps and printer's ink; and he had hopes that perhaps this might be an indication that the labours of the Survey were approaching an end, and that the time had arrived for finishing and printing off the maps. But he also saw a new item this year—"contract work." Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would explain what part of this work was done by contract. His chief object, however, was to inquire how long the Ordnance Survey was likely to be prolonged?

Mr. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he should like to hear some statement in reference to the claims of these officers from the President of the Board of Agriculture, who was responsible.

*Mr. HANBURY: The Treasury is responsible on the question of pensions; but with the exception of the amount referred to by my hon. Friend behind, the amounts are already passed.

Mr. DILLON said the Secretary to the Treasury had, no doubt, with his usual ability, made a case against throwing an additional charge on the Treasury. But he trusted that before the discussion was over they would have some statement from the head of the Department responsible for the work of the Survey. The Secretary to the Treasury made one remarkable statement. He said it had been reported by a Departmental Committee, which sat, he believed, in 1892, that the work was quite as well done by non-pensionable men as by men who were drawing pensions. That was a very wide issue to raise, because hon. Members knew there were many people in this country who opposed pensions of all kinds in the Civil Service, and if they were to be told that sort of thing with regard to one Department of the Civil Service, they would begin to ask, "Why not extend the principle to other Departments of the Civil Service?" The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that in spite of the fact that these men knew they were not going to have pensions, and that their salaries were fixed at a certain figure—which appeared to him to be very moderate—still plenty of men were willing to enter the service. Well, that argument, carried to its full extent, would justify sweating. ["Hear, hear!"] They knew well that with the competition which existed in this thickly populated country, they might probably do away with pensions in the Civil Service altogether, and reduce salaries at the same time, and yet be able to get plenty of poor fellows who were anxious to get in as long as they could earn a subsistence allowance. But that was not the point. The right hon. Gentleman had not, in his judgment, satisfactorily stated what were the grounds on which this Department of the Civil Service was to be treated worse than any other Department. The only attempt he had made at giving a reason for this discrimination as against the civil assistants of the Ordnance Survey Department was that some time ago it was the opinion of Sir Henry James—then the head of the Department—that his Department was going to come to an end in 1880, and that, therefore, it was unjust and unwise to the finances of the country to take on a fresh number of pensionable servants in a Department that was going to cease—and accordingly a minute was made enforcing the system of giving no pensions to the civil assistants. But it had turned out that the opinion of Sir Henry James was not a well-founded opinion. The Ordnance Department had not come to an end in 1880, and, as the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had pointed out, in 1897, not only were there no signs of its coming to an end, but there was an actual increase of expenditure. At the present moment there were 1,600 Civil assistants at work in the Ordnance Survey. In the Report of the Departmental Committee of 1892 it was stated that the question of superannuation was not one of the points referred to the Committee for consideration, but in the course of the proceedings several protests were made by witnesses against its exclusion, and the Committee thought it right to draw attention to the fact that this could not be regarded as a temporary Department of the Civil Service, but that it was necessary to maintain it as a permanent Department, and that although the question of superannuation was not referred to them in their reference, they felt that the question must sooner or later arise. That was to say that in 1892, 12 years after Sir Henry James recommended the abolition of superannuation on the ground that the Department would be wound up in 1880, this Committee give it as their judgment that it must be regarded as a permanent Department. It was only natural that when these clerks found themselves discriminated against and boycotted in the public service, they should consider they had a grievance.

*MR. HANBURY: That Report was considered the very next year, and 76 pensionable posts were created.

MR. DILLON said the Report of the Committee referred to the whole question. It stated that this Department must be regarded as a permanent Department of the Civil Service, and these men, being permanent Civil servants, it was not fair to say they should be treated on a different footing to other Civil servants of the Crown. In this country, whether for good or evil, the superannuation system had been extended to the whole of the Civil Service, and if they accepted that principle for one Department they were bound, in common equity and justice, to extend it to all Departments, unless there were special grounds why, in this particular Department, the superannuation principle ought not to apply. No ground or justification had been offered the Committee by the Secretary to the Treasury for treating this particular Department, which was admitted to be a permanent branch of the Civil Service, on different principles from those adopted in regard to every other branch. The right hon. Gentleman led the Committee to suppose that these officials were amply paid, and had no ground for grievance at all. But their maximum pay was very little over £2, while their minimum pay was something like 30s. per week, and that, too, for men who must be above the average clerk of the Civil Service in point of acquirements, education, and skill. Again, it was alleged that their work was particularly trying on the eyesight, and that a great number of them broke down because their sight became weak; and they were thus left without any resources at all. Another ground on which he thought that these servants were specially entitled to be better, rather than worse, treated than the servants of other Departments, was that, while promotion in every other branch of the Civil Service was open to the lower ranks, in this Department the upper ranks were almost entirely closed to the temporary Civil assistants, the whole of the superior and highly-paid offices being in the hands of the officers of the Royal Engineers. He thought it a cruel thing to deny them this right to a pension—whether they had notice of it on entering the Service or not—when there was no equivalent increase in their salaries in consequence of this denial of pension. He trusted that before this Vote was taken the President of the Board of Agriculture would endeavour to soften the stony heart of the Secretary to the Treasury and induce him to reconsider the matter.

MR. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.) suggested that those interested in this subject should induce the Secretary to the Treasury to receive a deputation, when the whole matter could be presented before him. He desired to thank the right hon. Gentleman for inaugurating a most useful change, by which Ordnance maps were now on sale at the post offices. He saw by the Report which was issued the previous day that, whereas in England and Wales there were formerly 111 agents for the sale of the maps, they were now procurable at 492 post offices in addition to the agencies; that, whereas in Scotland there were formerly only 15 depôts, the maps were now obtainable at 137 post offices; and that, as regarded Ireland, whereas there were previously only 12 places where the maps could be obtained, they were now on sale at 116 post offices. Altogether the maps could be bought at over 700 post offices throughout the United Kingdom, and that was a change upon which the right hon. Gentleman deserved to be congratulated. Something like a quarter of a million a year was spent in connection with the Ordnance Survey, and the receipts for the sale of the maps only amounted to £13,000 or £14,000. That was not at all satisfactory, and they ought to consider whether steps could not possibly be taken to increase the sales. He would suggest that, in order to bring about this result, more liberal terms of commission should be offered the agents who sold them, and that the price of the maps should be reduced. If this were done he was convinced the sales would rapidly increase. He had lately taken a house at Littlestone in Kent, not far from London, and neither in the one-inch nor in the six-inch map was Littlestone shown, nor the railway that led to it. This might possibly explain why the maps were not sold, although £250,000 a year was spent on the Ordnance Survey. The place had grown up within the last 15 years, and yet was not in the maps, which were not brought up to date as quickly as they ought to be.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. WALTER LONG, Liverpool, West Derby) said the hon. Member for East Mayo asked for his views with reference to the claim for pensionable rights on the part of the Civil Assistants in the Ordnance Survey Department. It was not his duty as a Minister to decide the questions relating to pensions. The decision on those points rested with the Treasury. The Secretary to the Treasury had announced what that decision was, and it seemed to him that he had firmly established the position taken up in regard to the administration of the Ordnance Survey. He himself did not believe it was in the best interests of the Civil Assistants that their case should be repeated and reinforced. If an attempt were made to increase the cost of the administration of the Department, the alternative indicated by the Secretary to the Treasury would be arrived at with greater rapidity than he hoped it would be. The hon. Member for Gloucester asked when the existing survey would be completed. Dates were given in the Estimates for the completion of the various services, but it was not for himself to say, having regard to the great interest attaching to the Survey, and the great importance of having useful and efficient maps, that the work would be finally determined even by 1920. The increased Estimate was accounted for in this way. Under the head of "Pay" there was an increased Estimate of £1,500. That was a slightly increased sum which he obtained from the Treasury in the hope that he might be able, by means of the employment of additional men, to complete certain portions of the work within the time specified. £1,000 was for the engraving work which had been put out on contract, it being found impossible to get the hill engraving performed within the necessary time unless outside assistance were obtained. It was an experiment, and until they saw the result it was impossible for him to express an opinion. Owing to the increase in the sale of the 25-inch map, further expenditure on paper and materials was necessary. The hon. Member for Islington expressed satisfaction with the new arrangement for the sale of ordnance maps, and asked some detailed questions which it would be premature for him to answer. The new arrangement had only just come into existence. The deposit of index maps at post offices, and the appointment of various agents in the provinces, were entirely new. It did not rest with postmasters to sell the maps. They were supplied with the prices of the maps, which could be seen on application, and were to send in requisitions for such maps as might be applied for, which would then be supplied from Southampton. It was, therefore, undesirable to give them more than a small commission on that part of their work. The hon. Member found fault with the existing Survey because Littlestone was not found on the map. He could not account for the non-appearance of this place, but now that the hon. Member had gone to live there no doubt it would soon obtain notoriety. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"] When the Survey was taken the existence of the place was certainly not known, but no doubt it would find a place in the map when the next survey of that part of the country was taken. He could assure the hon. Member that the Department would do all it could to increase the usefulness and sale of the maps and to bring them easily within the reach of the public in all parts of the country. He did not, however, think there could at present be any reduction in price. The Department were doing their best with the money at their disposal, and if they increased the salaries of the staff he did not see how the price of the maps could be reduced.

Mr. CLANCY pressed for a further answer to the points raised by the hon. Member for East Mayo, with regard to the Civil Assistants in the Ordnance Department. The Secretary to the Treasury was standing out for strict observance of the contract with the Temporary Civil Assistants. But the Government were not observing their part of the contract, because he found that these Temporary Civil Assistants were subjected to all the restrictions of the Civil Service, such as being debarred from taking outside employment, and compulsory retirement at a certain age, and these restrictions were not imposed until long after they entered the service—in fact, they were imposed during the last few years. If the Government had not observed their part of the contract what right had they to assume that they ought not to give pensions because 20 or 30 years ago it was announced in a mysterious hole and corner fashion that pensions would not be given?

Vote agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £24,037 (including an additional sum of £11,950), be granted to Her Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for maintaining certain harbours, lighthouses, etc. under the Board of Trade."

Mr. CLANCY said he objected to any Vote proposed—not that he had any objection to any particular item, but on the ground that he should object to every shilling that it was attempted to give to England or Scotland. His sole and simple objection was to vote money for Great Britain, while under existing circumstances Ireland was called upon to pay an undue proportion according to her resources to keep up English establishments, and the present Government having refused redress on that subject, the Irish Members were bound to take the course of opposing every Vote for England and Scotland until there was redress. He might be allowed to say that what was promised last week had in no way redressed the grievance of which Ireland complained. The statement of the First Lord of the Treasury meant the giving to Ireland in one particular matter only equal treatment to that already accorded to England and Scotland. Under the Agricultural Railway Act there was taken for England out of the Imperial purse—

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: Order, order! To discuss that would be out of order. The point the hon. Member is anxious to raise should be raised in Committee of Ways and Means. There is here no question of taxation, it is only a question of granting the money.

Mr. CLANCY said they were now granting public money, and as to the Committee of Ways and Means he gathered that it was a fiction and of no consequence at all. The Government had not attempted to grapple with the financial grievances of Ireland, which remained unredressed.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said with all respect he could not take the view that they were not entitled to raise the question on this Vote. That seemed to be a proper and constitutional occasion for raising a grievance of which Ireland complained. ["Hear, hear!"] They were voting money, than which nothing could be more important, and his hon. Friend argued, as he would argue, that Ireland was paying more than her fair share. He certainly should regret if they were debarred from raising a question of this sort. The organ of the Government in the public Press had taken up the position that the recent concession to Ireland was a concession meeting the Financial Relations Commission. It was nothing of the kind. All that was promised was that on one little narrow point equal treatment with England would be dealt out to Ireland.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said it must be obvious to the hon. Member that they could not discuss on the Vote for harbours and lighthouses whether or not Ireland paid her fair share of the general taxation. The hon. Member would be perfectly entitled to discuss whether too much money under this Vote was spent on English and Scotch harbours.

MR. J. REDMOND said that the position he was taking up was absolutely relevant to this Vote. He objected to vote this money. Why? Because Ireland had to pay too large a proportion of it. He pointed to the Report of the Commission, and he contended that the recent promise of the Government did not meet the case. He did not, of course, attempt to go into the details of this matter, but he felt it to be his duty to point out at the earliest opportunity that the proposals of the Government did not in the remotest degree touch the contention that Ireland had to pay too much. What had recently been proposed by the Government did not touch the fringe of that question.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: I see no reason to change the opinion which I have expressed, and I hope the hon. Member will not persist in discussing the subject.

MR. J. REDMOND: I must, Sir, insist on my rights.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: I must ask the hon. Member to resume his seat.

MR. REDMOND: That is a request which has not been made to me for 15 years.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Does the hon. Member decline to resume his seat?

MR. REDMOND: Yes, Sir; I must respectfully decline.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Then I must name the hon. Member, Mr. Redmond, for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): I therefore, Sir, beg to move that the hon. Member for Waterford be suspended from the service of the House.

MR. CLANCY: Must you not Report that to the Speaker?

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Yes, but the Committee must decide first.

Question put, "That Mr. John Redmond be suspended from the service of the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 223; Noes, 32.—(Division List, No. 223.)

The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER having resumed the Chair,

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said: Mr. Speaker, I have to report to you that, during the discussion of a Resolution in Supply, it became my duty to call to order the hon. Member for Waterford City, and, in consequence of persistent irrelevance, I requested him to resume his seat under the Standing Orders of the House. He stated that he would decline to comply with my order, and it then became necessary for me to name the hon. Member. In consequence of that, a Motion was made that the hon. Member should be suspended from the service of the House, and I have to report to you, Sir, that that Motion was put and was carried in Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER forthwith put the question, "That Mr. John Redmond be suspended from the service of the House."

The House divided:—Ayes, 238; Noes, 52.—(Division List, No. 224.)

*MR. SPEAKER having declared the result of the Division, said: I do not see the hon. Member in his place, but if he is here I must call upon him to withdraw from the House.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND, who had, before the House was cleared for a Division, taken a seat in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery, made no sign of obedience to Mr. Speaker's order.

*MR. SPEAKER (after a brief interval): If the hon. Member is in any part of the House, he must withdraw from the precincts in obedience to the orders of the House.

Mr. John Redmond at once left the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery.

Mr. Speaker vacated the Chair, and the House again went into Committee of Supply, the Chairman of Ways and Means in the Chair.

Mr. CLANCY resumed the Debate on the Vote. He said that before the Vote was passed or put to the Committee he desired to reiterate the reasons he had already given for objecting to it, and to every other Vote for England and Scotland. His reason was that Ireland was called upon to contribute out of its due proportion to the cost of English and Scottish services. A Royal Commission had recently sat and inquired into the question of the over-taxation of Ireland, and the Report of that Commission established beyond doubt or question that Ireland was overtaxed. That being so—

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I have already ruled more than once on that point, that that question cannot be raised upon Votes in Supply. It must be raised in Committee of Ways and Means. This is not the proper time to raise it. I hope the hon. Member will therefore not persist in continued irrelevancy.

Mr. CLANCY: I thought, and I still think, that to raise the question, in general terms, of the over-taxation of Ireland on every Vote was the most relevant thing I could do—[*Irish cheers*]—when we are called upon to contribute to the cost of English and Scottish services. And I must respectfully press my right to discuss this matter. [*Ministerial cries of* "Order!"]

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I understand the hon. Member desires to persist in disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. CLANCY: I desire to say that I persist in discussing this question which is now before the House upon the grounds —[*loud Ministerial cries of* "Order!"] —which I have already stated, and I think—

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I have already ruled that that is not a sufficient ground, and that the matter cannot be discussed in Supply. If the hon. Member persists in discussing it in Supply I must regard his conduct as grossly disorderly, and, under these circumstances, I must request him to withdraw from the House.

Mr. CLANCY: I consider the decision unjust—[*Ministerial cries of* "Order!"] —and I am not disposed to submit to injustice. [*Irish cheers and Ministerial cries of* "Order!"]

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: I have directed the hon. Member to withdraw from the House. Do I understand the hon. Member refuses to obey?

Mr. CLANCY: I do, Sir.

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: Then I must call on the Serjeant-at-Arms to enforce the order I gave. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Send for the Horse Guards! [*Laughter.*]

The Serjeant-at-Arms approached the hon. Member for Dublin County, N., who at once rose from his seat and left the House amid Nationalist cheers and Ministerial laughter.

Mr. W. REDMOND rose, amid Ministerial laughter and Nationalist cheers, and said: On a point of order, Mr. Lowther, I desire to ask you whether it is in order for you to order the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove an hon. Member without having first asked the leave of the House to do so? [*Cheers.*]

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: Oh! yes, certainly. [*Ministerial cheers.*]

Mr. W. REDMOND: May I ask, Sir, on a further point of order, whether we are to understand that we are in this position—that at any time we are liable to be removed from the House by the Serjeant-at-Arms by an order from the Chair?

*The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS: That depends on hon. Members. If hon. Members are disorderly in their conduct it is my duty to order them to withdraw under the Rules of the House. [*Ministerial cheers.*]

Mr. W. REDMOND: Well, Mr. Lowther, opinions may differ—[*cries of* "Order!" *and laughter*]—as to what is disorderly conduct; but I think it is not only grossly disorderly, but grossly criminal, to rob a country and then gag its representatives—[*cheers and cries of* "Order!"]—and order them out of the House when they simply raise their voice in order to enforce a demand which has been unanimously given utterance to throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. [*Cheers.*] I certainly on this Vote now before the House desire to say that I take this opportunity, and shall take every opportunity, of objecting to the participation of Ireland in a single one of these Votes in the present circumstances. It has been abundantly proved that the Irish people are taxed altogether out of proportion. [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: I do not know whether it is really necessary for me to repeat what I have already ruled—that that question cannot be raised in Committee of Supply. There are other and proper opportunities for raising that question. ["Hear, hear!"] All I have ruled this afternoon is that this is not a proper occasion for raising that question, and if the hon. Member persists in disregarding my ruling I am afraid I shall have to put the Standing Order in force. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. W. REDMOND: I think you should take into consideration, Mr. Lowther, that when you gave your, no doubt, weighty ruling I was not present. I cannot, therefore, be expected to know what your ruling was, and if you have got a ruling that applies to me, I must ask you to explain it. My point at the present time is that I object to this Vote because I object to the Irish people being called on to bear a share in these expenses, and I fail altogether to see—and I say so with great respect—how it is I am out of order in endeavouring to show why it is I object to the Irish people being called on to participate in this Vote. [*Cheers.*] I do so because I think it is unjust to the Irish people, in view of the fact that it is perfectly well known to the House and this country that the Irish people are taxed more than they ought to be in proportion to the people of this country, and that, as a matter of fact, we are being robbed in Ireland. [*Ministerial cries of* "Order, order!"] I do not know whether that is grossly disorderly or not, but I consider that I am but discharging a very simple duty to my constituents and the Irish people when I take this opportunity of protesting as strongly as I can against what is undoubtedly a system of robbery practised on the Irish people. [*Cheers.*] In view of the Report of the Royal Commission on the financial relations—[*cries of* "Order!" *and cheers*]—

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The hon. Member is perfectly entitled to object to this Vote on the ground that it is too large and that too much money is spent on English and Scotch harbours and not enough on Irish harbours; but the question of the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland cannot be discussed on this Vote. I think the hon. Member will see—on reflection it will be obvious to him—that it must be so, because otherwise the same question can be raised on every Vote, and that would clearly be against the ordinary rules and practice of the House. ["Hear, hear!"] Therefore that seems to me to be sufficient ground, amongst others, for saying that the question cannot be discussed now, and therefore I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the Vote.

MR. W. REDMOND: I have listened to your ruling, Mr. Lowther, very patiently. [*Loud laughter.*] I think every patience is required by hon. Members who, if they say a word on behalf of their countrymen, are liable to be suspended. [*Cheers.*] Hon. Members opposite seem to think it is extremely amusing to see Irish Members interfered with in expressing what they consider to be the demands of their countrymen. ["Hear, hear!"] I should like very much to see English, Scotch, and Welsh Members labouring under the same grievance we are labouring under in this financial matter. Such treatment as we have received would not be meted out to them. [*Cheers.*] I really cannot see how it is possible for me to give my reasons for objecting to this Vote without going into the question of the relative taxation of Ireland and Great Britain. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!" *and* "Order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: If that is so, the hon. Member will be disorderly, for he will be violating the ruling I have laid down. If the hon. Member persists in that course I shall have to put the Standing Order in force. [*Cheers.*]

MR. W. REDMOND: May I ask you, Mr. Lowther, in all seriousness—[*laughter*]—upon my word and honour—[*renewed laughter*]—it is extremely hard for Irish Members to take this treatment seriously—do I understand you to say that I am grossly disorderly in simply referring to the relative taxation of Ireland and Great Britain? Because, if that is your ruling, all I can say is that it is like a ruling in one of Gilbert and Sullivan's operas. [*Laughter, cheers, and cries of* "Order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The hon. Member is grossly disorderly in his last remark. [*Cheers.*] My ruling is not to the effect quoted by the hon. Member. My ruling is that the hon. Member is not entitled on the present occasion to discuss the question of the financial relations of Great Britain and Ireland. If he cannot state his objections to this Vote without discussing that question, there is no necessity for him to state them, and he can remain silent. ["Hear, hear!"] If, however, he persists in stating them, and bringing that question in, I shall have to take some steps. [*Cheers.*]

MR. W. REDMOND: On the question of whether it is necessary for me to state my objections or not, I beg leave to state that you really are not the judge. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and cheers.*] I am, after all, sent here to say what may be considered necessary, in the opinion of my constituents, and not in the opinion of either the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker of this House—[*cheers*]—and at the risk of being considered disorderly, I do say it is adding insult to injury to say not only that we are overtaxed, but when we attempt to say so, we are practically gagged and subjected to—— [*Loud cries of* "Order"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The hon. Member is now grossly disorderly, and I must request him to withdraw from the House for the remainder of this day's sitting. [*Cheers.*]

MR. W. REDMOND: I certainly shall not withdraw unless you send the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove me.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS directed the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove the hon. Member.

Mr. ERSKINE approached the hon. Member for Clare, E., who at once rose from his seat and passed down the Gangway, previously exclaiming, "I simply protest against the continual robbery of Ireland. You have done it for a century. It is a most outrageous thing." The hon. Member then left the House, amid cheers from his supporters and Ministerial laughter.

MR. W. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick), who rose amid loud Ministerial laughter and Nationalist cheers, said he objected to this Vote because it was proposed to expend a large sum on English harbours without making any provision for Irish harbours, although for many years past the Irish Members had been complaining of the want of funds for the repair of various harbours in Ireland. It was well-known that many harbours in Ireland were in a very unsatisfactory state. The hon. Member proceeded: I have no intention whatever of taking up the time of the House, but I do protest as one who takes an interest in the financial relations of the two countries. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members may laugh, but this is an exceedingly serious question to the Irish people. I have no wish to run counter to the Rules of the House or to dispute your ruling, Sir; but I claim the right of free speech—[*cheers*]—in a matter on which I believe the majority of my countrymen agree with me; and I challenge any Gentleman who represents a Unionist constituency to deny that the majority of the people of Ireland believe that they are overtaxed. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and cheers.*]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: Order, order! The hon. Member is evidently anxious to disregard the ruling I have recently given. I hope he will not force me to put the Standing Order in force. I have had to do it in the case of some of his colleagues, and I warn him that if he persists in the course he is pursuing I shall have to do so in his case

MR. FIELD: I am exceedingly sorry, but I consider it my duty to obey what I believe to be the opinion of the majority of my countrymen, that we are overtaxed—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: The conduct of the hon. Member is, in my opinion, grossly disorderly, and I must request him to leave the House during the rest of the sitting.

MR. FIELD: I will obey.

The hon. Member for Dublin, St. Patrick, rose and withdrew accordingly, amid laughter and cheers.

Question put, and agreed to.

3. Motion made and Question proposed :—

> "That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1898, for constructing a new Harbour of Refuge at Peterhead."

Mr. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.), who rose amid cries of "Hear, hear," and "Order," said he had been nearly 15 years in the House, and during the whole of that time they had been voting something every year towards Peterhead Harbour. The time had come, he thought, when they ought to have from the Government some definite information as to when the work would be completed.

*General RUSSELL (Cheltenham) said he happened to have a villa in the Peterhead district, and he had watched this money being thrown into the sea. Very recently he took the opportunity of visiting the works on the harbour of refuge and consulting with the very able and intelligent engineer in charge. He had put down a Motion to reduce this Vote by £10,000, but after consulting with the engineer and discussing the whole question with those best qualified to judge, he withdrew his Motion, for he came to the conclusion that the only thing to be done was to continue the work if they did not sacrifice the large sum of money that had been already spent upon it. The House must bear in mind that a large convict prison had been built there solely for the purpose of making the harbour of refuge. He was doubtful whether it would be of much use when made. Formerly, before steamers existed, sailing vessels used to take refuge between the heads of the bay, which give protection from the north and north-west winds, the prevalent winds in that part of the country. But now that so much of their carrying trade was done by means of steam transport, it was very doubtful whether a harbour of refuge at that spot would be of any use at all. As far as he could make out, he should never see it finished. The engineer told him the other day that, calculating according to the most favourable circumstances, it could not be finished for twenty-six years. He wished to call the attention of the Committee to the circumstance that originally the scheme was adopted by the gentlemen who sat opposite when they were in office, so that hon. members on the Government side of the House were in no way responsible for this waste of money, as he considered it. Still, he should be very sorry, taking all the circumstances into consideration, if this Vote were to be suspended, and hence that the money which had already been expended on the harbour of refuge should not be put to some use. It was asserted, as a reason of making this harbour of refuge, that it was the only way to employ the convicts, and, as he had said, for that reason a very large convict prison had been built at a cost of about £25,000. At the end of the 26 years, if the work was ever finished, there would be a harbour of refuge magnificent in size, capable of sheltering a large part of the British Navy ; but whether it would be of much use was a matter of great doubt. Still, under all the circumstances of the case, seeing that the present Government was not responsible for the scheme being entered into, he hoped the Committee would sanction the continuance of the expenditure and make the best of a bad bargain.

Mr. DILLON said that after the remarkable speech they had just listened to, he hoped the Government would re-consider their policy. The hon. Member concluded a strong speech against the Vote by hoping that the Vote would be sanctioned. He had given the Committee the information for which he had himself been seeking in vain ; for he had told them on good authority that the harbour would probably not be finished for the next 26 years. They were told 10 years ago that it would be finished before now. In the judgment of the hon. Member who lived in the neighbourhood, when finished it would be a magnificent harbour, but probably there would be no ships to enter it, and it would be perfectly worthless.

*General RUSSELL : I did not quite say that, I think, but I do not believe it will be of the use it was originally intended to be when the idea was first conceived, as then most of the merchant traffic was carried in sailing ships.

Mr. DILLON: What was the principle set forth by the hon. Member? It seemed that this harbour of refuge at Peterhead was to cost close on a million sterling. He was told by an hon. Member sitting near him that the sum so far expended on the work was £297,000. Therefore the argument was because you had spent £297,000 on a useless work, you must spend £600,000 more for fear the £297,000 should be wasted. Was there ever such logic? [Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member came from the district and the money would be spent in his own constituency——

*General RUSSELL: It is not my constituency.

Mr. DILLON: I beg pardon — in the district in which he lives. I apologise. He admitted, practically speaking, that according to the original intention of those who sanctioned the undertaking, it would be useless—that was to say that it was not going to be of any use that would justify the expenditure of such an enormous sum of money. He was content to put it in that way. A sum of £297,000 had been spent; therefore to prevent that being wasted, they were to spend £600,000 more spread over a period of six years. He saw that the original estimate for Peterhead was £730,000, and £160,000 had been added. In addition to that expenditure, they had, of course, the cost of the convict establishment, and everybody knew that convict labour on such works was an extremely expensive form of labour. He protested against this Vote. He protested against it first of all as a British taxpayer—he could not protest against it as an Irish. He protested against this Vote of the money of the British taxpayer, and although his own contribution to the revenue of this great Empire was extremely small, still he gave it with a most grudging hand. It was but a small amount of income tax that it was his privilege to pay—he wished it was a great deal more; but he gave it with a grudging hand, and he objected to a portion of that income tax being spent on Peterhead Harbour. [*Laughter*]. And he objected to it all the more because the Chairman had been kind enough to point out that they were at liberty to discuss these Votes on from the point of view of the relative expenditure on these Votes in Ireland and England. He had in his mind at that moment the harbour of Wicklow, in regard to which appeals had repeatedly been made in vain to the Treasury, and in respect of which a most influential deputation, composed not of Nationalists alone, but of Unionists and men of all classes, had waited on the Treasury and on the Chief Secretary for Ireland. That harbour which could be put in repair for a small sum of money, was left to go to ruin, to silt up, the water rushing in and out of a big hole in the breakwater—he had himself inspected the scandalous condition of things. In a moment the whole thing might be swept away, and for the sake of a few thousand pounds they left that scandalous and disgraceful condition of things in a poor country like Ireland, while they were recklessly spending this enormous sum at Peterhead on a work that would be useless. It was a monstrous, an extravagant, waste of money; and they were entitled and bound to raise their voices against such Votes being passed. He protested against this with all the more confidence and strength because, as he had already said, Peterhead Harbour had been one of the chronic grievances of the House of Commons. It had come up every year for the last ten or fifteen years, and he should unquestionably divide the House against it unless an equivalent amount on a liberal scale was given where it was required in Ireland.

The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) was not quite sure whether the hon. Gentleman opposite knew what the origin of this Harbour of Refuge was, or how this Vote came upon the Paper. It was the result of a Committee summoned in 1881 to inquire into various questions in connection with the employment of convicts. They reported that the best method of employing convicts was in the establishment of the most suitable form of public works, and that the most suitable form of public works on which they could be employed was the formation of harbours of refuge; and they recommended Peterhead as the best place on the east coast for constructing such a harbour.

In accordance with that recommendation a scheme was prepared by an eminent firm of engineers and sanctioned by the House. The progress of the work had necessarily been slow. He did not think that the House had ever been told that it was likely to be finished by the present time, and he certainly could not hold out any hope of its completion before many years had elapsed. His hon. and gallant Friend's estimate of the time that would be required was probably correct. Quick progress was next to impossible at present on account of the rocky nature of the bottom on which the breakwater had been founded. The sum included for this purpose in the Estimate was the largest sum which they could hope to expend this year, having regard to the difficulties of the work. It was expected when the structure was begun that on the average 500 convicts would be available, but during the past year the average number of available men had not exceeded 250. He supposed he ought to congratulate Scotland upon that fact, but it was not conducive to rapid progress with the work. He trusted that the hon. Member would not Divide the Committee against this proposal. Scotch Members had repeatedly urged that the work was of the utmost importance, and it was a means of employing convict labour usefully.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said that he was at the Home Office when it was decided to undertake this work, and that its main object was to provide employment for convicts. Portland breakwater was at that time approaching conclusion, and there was not a sufficient field for convict labour. The claims of Dover were urged in rivalry with those of Peterhead, and the Scotch Members, who were rather pertinacious in supporting the rights of their country, maintained that the harbour should be at Peterhead, and that Scotland should supply criminals for the purpose of constructing it. [*Laughter.*] They could not but feel gratified at the fact that the general reform in character and manners in Scotland had now reduced the number of those who could be employed upon the breakwater. He assured the Committee that the work was only decided upon after great consideration by the Home Office. It was a departmental undertaking, dictated by no political or party considerations. If the Committee desired that the harbour should be finished in a shorter time than was now contemplated, they must decide to employ other labour than that of convicts.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that if the object was to provide a harbour of refuge for vessels on the eastern coast of Scotland, the sooner the harbour was finished the better. An inordinate amount of time had already been spent upon the work. The whole coast of Algiers had been supplied with deep water harbours of this nature since this Peterhead harbour was begun.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN explained that there were great difficulties at Peterhead caused by the nature of the bottom on which the foundations of the breakwater had to be laid. The work could only be proceeded with at certain states of the tides and at low water.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES referred the hon. Member to the case of the harbour at Bona on the coast of Algiers. In that case great difficulties were encountered on account of the depth of the water, but they were successfully overcome. A rising and falling tide was not a disadvantage when a harbour was being built. It was, on the contrary, an advantage. At Bona there was no tide of the kind. When the Peterhead harbour was begun the science of constructing harbours on hard bottoms was in its infancy. In the last few years new methods had been devised. Bags containing Portland cement or other substances in a fluid state were let down, and the contents solidified when they reached the bottom. The harbour at La Guayra on the Spanish main was constructed in that way. He appreciated the affection for the convicts shown by Her Majesty's Government, but his affections inclined rather to the seamen on our coasts, and for their sakes he was anxious to see this harbour at Peterhead completed.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that the construction of harbours of refuge had been recommended at other places besides Peterhead. Waterford, for example had long ago been mentioned by a Commission of experts as one of the best points at which to construct a harbour of refuge on the south coast of Ireland. Nothing, however, had been done, although a harbour could be constructed at Waterford at less cost than at any other place in the south of Ireland. At present Waterford was a fairly good harbour, but there was a bar there which could be removed with ease at a comparatively small cost, and which would then secure a harbour of refuge on that coast which was greatly needed. The Irish people had a right to complain that while they contributed largely to expenditure of this kind it was all for England and Scotland and Wales, nothing whatever being spent in improving the harbours of Ireland.

*General RUSSELL, replying to the hon. Member for Lynn Regis, stated that it was impossible to advance the work at Peterhead Harbour more rapidly, and the experiments which the hon. Member had described as being carried out in the case of a Spanish harbour would not be practicable at Peterhead. In the first place there was a very stormy sea, and it was only possible to work something like 115 days a year out of the 365. The only way the harbour could be completed sooner would be by working at night, and this would quadruple the cost, as the convicts could not be employed during the night. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty had said that the work might progress more rapidly when they got into deeper water, but the information he obained was just the opposite, and he was told that when they got into the deeper water the progress would be even slower than now.

Mr. DILLON said that his recollections of the Peterhead Harbour were somewhat different to those of the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, but the origin of this work was lost in the mists of antiquity, and its completion would be one of the events of the next century. Nobody knew when the work would be completed, but everybody agreed that it would not be before the next century. The hon. Member for King's Lynn was, of course, as usual, wide of the mark. The primary object of this harbour was not to afford protection to shipping. It had two objects with both of which he sympathised. One was to employ convicts, under healthy circumstances, on the sea coast, and the second was to spend some money in Scotland. Such being the condition of affairs, it did not in the least matter when the harbour was finished, and if it could be kept going for the next half century so much the better. He had listened to the appeal which the Civil Lord of the Admiralty had made to him to withdraw his opposition to this Vote. He would have been delighted to have done so if the Government would have given them some *quid pro quo* in regard to Irish harbours. They were now asked to vote £12,000, the sum required for this year being £24,000. It was universally admitted, firstly, that the longer the harbour took to complete the better it would be; and secondly, that the supply of convicts in Scotland was scarce, and unless they could be manufactured on a larger scale the harbour could not be built at the present rate with convict labour. Let the Government take say, £10,000 off the sum required for the year, and give it to Wicklow Harbour. If Scotch convicts were allowed to be employed in the healthy work of harbour construction, why should not Irish convicts be employed in the same way instead of being immersed in Mountjoy and other prisons? There were no convict prisons in Ireland where the Irish convicts had any outdoor occupation, and none where they were employed in building harbours of refuge, though the Irish required them much more than the Scotch. Every argument which could be used in support of convict labour for Peterhead Harbour was applicable in the case of Ireland, where convicts were manufactured out of material which would not be turned into convicts in England and Scotland. In Ireland, packed juries made convicts of men who had committed no crimes.

*General RUSSELL could assure the hon. Gentleman that on the occasion he last visited the prison at Peterhead, a number of Irish convicts were among those employed on the works there.

Mr. DILLON said that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman desired to insinuate that the Irish people, whether they lived in this country or in Ireland, contributed more than their share to the criminal jails, he had to reply that the statement was false. He had heard that charge made before, although there was not one shadow of foundation for it. A criminal judge made the same statement in Australia, and he at once challenged the assertion. It was then shown that while the Irish did maintain a high ratio as regarded minor offences, when it came to crimes of a grave kind the Irish people were considerably below what would have been their proportion. There was, therefore, no truth in the statement that his countrymen contributed an undue share to any convict prison, and the observation of the hon. and gallant Gentleman was most insulting.

*General RUSSELL could assure the hon. Gentleman that he did not intend the observation as an insult.

Mr. DILLON: It was a very insulting observation.

*General RUSSELL said that if he had unintentionally hurt the hon. Gentleman's feelings he withdrew the observation, repeating that he did not intend it in any way as an insult.

Mr. DILLON accepted the explanation, and intimated that unless some concession were made in regard to Wicklow or some other Irish harbours, he should be compelled to divide the Committee against the Vote.

Mr. WEIR maintained that if the work at Peterhead was to be of service it ought to be advanced speedily; if it was not to be of service then it ought to be dropped and the money spent in more useful ways on harbour accommodation elsewhere. He felt it keenly that while there were so many harbours needed all round the coast of Scotland, especially in the north, the Government were practically throwing this large sum of money into the sea. He called attention to the item of £21,840 for labour and materials for 1897-98, an increase of £404. The engineer-in-chief at Peterhead received £800 a year for 110 days' work, and the resident engineer £750. Was the engineer-in-chief a retired naval or military officer? [Mr. A. Chamberlain: "No; he is Mr. John Coode!"] How often did he visit the works? It seemed to him that £150 as expenses was a large item, and he had come to the conclusion that this official was a useless individual, whose services were not wanted. He believed that the resident engineer would do the work quite satisfactorily.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomery) supported the appeal of the hon. Member for East Mayo on behalf of Irish harbours. It had been well shown that the money now being spent at Peterhead was spent for an indirect rather than for a direct purpose. At the same time he felt that the claims of the Irish harbours were largely bound up with the claims of the Welsh harbours. For example, there was no communication between mid-Wales and the opposite coast of Ireland, except by the long sea route from Waterford to Milford Haven. There was a harbour on the Irish coast called Roslare, which with a little expenditure of money could be fitted for cross-channel traffic, and by taking Aberdovey on the Welsh coast there would be a third alternative route made between the two coasts, and embracing districts which were at present destitute of communication. The Report of a distinguished civil engineer stated that by an expenditure of less than £100,000 a harbour could be made at Aberdovey with great depth of water at all times of the tide. Anything which would increase the traffic in that district would contribute materially to the prosperity of the population.

Mr. P. J. POWER hoped that the Government would give consideration to the Report of the Royal Commission which recommended the improvement of Waterford as a harbour.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that his position in this matter was simply this—when the work was decided upon the Admiralty were asked to take charge and superintend the execution of the work. It was not a part of the Admiralty policy that this harbour at Peterhead should be built, and the policy of building such works was no concern of the Admiralty. As to the salary of the engineer-in-chief he stated that the work could not be done by the resident engineer. The engineer-in-chief was connected with a firm which had probably the widest experience in this class of work of any engineers to be found. The Government had had their assistance in the preparation of the Dover Harbour plan, and they had designed harbours and dockyards in all parts of the world, and the value of whose advice could hardly be exaggerated. Though the resident engineer was a very competent man he was not in the position to take the place of the engineer-in-chief. The salary of the engineer-in-chief covered all clerical assistance and the payments for draughtsmanship in the office in London, but the travelling expenses were paid apart on a scale sanctioned by the Treasury.

Mr. WEIR proposed, "That Item B (Salaries) be reduced by £300, in respect of the salary of the Chief Engineer."

Mr. DILLON intimated that he contested the whole Vote.

Mr. WEIR said he would in that case withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) remarked that a Royal Commission reported in favour of a harbour of refuge on the east coast of Scotland which was being constructed, and now it was proposed to stop the work that £12,000 should be devoted to similar work for Ireland. £40,000 a year had been spent on the construction of a harbour at Holyhead. The west coast of Scotland had plenty of natural harbours, but a harbour of refuge was much needed on the east coast which was often very rough and stormy, and where ships and lives were frequently lost. Convict labour was being used in the construction of the harbour which did not seem likely to be finished for the next 20 or 30 years. Free labour should be employed and more money devoted to the work that it might be finished in the near future.

Original Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 147; Noes, 32.—(Division List, No. 225.)

4. £189,367, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) called attention to the injustice of the valuation of Woolwich Arsenal for the purpose of contribution in lieu of rates, and asked the Secretary to the Treasury whether he would consider appeals from the Government Valuer, inquire into the complaints of the assessment committee, and give them an opportunity of stating their case. The noble Lord stated that the Woolwich Assessment Committee were very much discontented with the way they were treated by the Government Valuer, who appeared to act in a very arbitrary and dictatorial manner, and would give no details as to the basis on which he made his valuation. The Assessment Committee greatly wished to have an opportunity of putting their side of the case before the Treasury.

Mr. J. C. FLYNN (Cork, N.) drew attention to the charge of £10,000 for the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. He failed to see why the Metropolitan Fire Brigade should get this subsidy from the Government any more than those of Dublin, Cork, Belfast, or anywhere else. No doubt there was a considerable amount of Government property in London, but so there was in Dublin also; and considering the enormous rateable valuation of the metropolis, he thought that Dublin was even more entitled to a contribution than London was. It was a paltry and contemptible thing that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, which was under municipal management, should come on the general taxpayers in this way. Either the item should be struck out of the rates altogether, or the fire insurance companies, who made such huge profits, should subsidise this £10,000. Really, when property was insured up to the full value, the municipalty had no interest in extinguishing a fire. The insurance companies had obviously the paramount interest in the matter.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES called attention to the item of "rates on houses occupied by representatives of foreign Powers," which had gone up this year by £800. He was glad to see this figure in the Votes, because he thought all remissions granted on the ground of comity should be subjected to the control and criticism of the House of Commons; but he should like to have an explanation of how it was the charge had increased by 25 per cent. He did not know whether the habit was growing among foreign Ambassadors and Attachés of taking larger houses than they formerly occupied, but, if so, considering the enormous and increasing proportion that rates now bear to rental, the item would become a very large one in future years, more especially if this country should be invaded by a wealthier type of Attaché.

Mr. B. L. COHEN (Islington, E.) wished to see the contribution to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade increased rather than struck off the Votes. He agreed, however, that the fire insurance companies did not pay as much as they ought towards expenditure which went very much to increase their own profits. He pointed out that while the contribution had not been added to for a great many years, the expense of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, which falls on the County Council, had increased by an enormous sum in the last few years, while he claimed that the work of the Brigade was done with an efficiency which was a model to any provincial or continental town.

CAPTAIN PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) drew attention to the fact that while the War Department properly contributed to rates Volunteer drill-halls escaped without any contribution at all.

MR. WEIR asked for an explanation of the item of rates paid on behalf of occupiers of apartments in Royal palaces.

*MR. HANBURY said that as to the question of remission of rates, they were not really remissions, as there was no power to enforce the payment by representatives of foreign countries. For some time the arrangement was that the rates on houses occupied by representatives of foreign Governments should be paid by the landlords. But the foreign Governments protested, and now it was arranged that some of the rates should be paid by Her Majesty's Government and the remander by the Diplomatic Body. This arrangement was confined to those representatives whose Governments gave reciprocal privileges to our Diplomatic Service. The reason why the item in the Votes on account of these rates had gone up was that one house, occupied by a foreign Attaché, was a great deal above the rateable value of the houses generally occupied by officials in that position. As to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade grant, he agreed that the contribution ought to be considered by the Treasury. This contribution was made originally because the Government did not pay their full share of the rates in respect of Government buildings. Now that the system—which he believed to be just—of the Government paying in the same proportion as private individuals had been introduced, the argument for making this contribution to the Fire Brigade was not so strong. As to the rating of Volunteer drill halls, one reason why the Government did not think that they should pay the rates was their opinion that the localities might fairly be asked to contribute so much to the local Volunteer corps. As to the rating of Woolwich Arsenal, the policy of the Government was to pay rates in the same proportion as the private person. But they felt it necessary to insist that the valuation of Government property should be made by Government Valuers. Government property differed very largely from other property, and was situated in many different localities. The Government could not place themselves entirely in the hands of the local authorities, who might make one estimate of the property here and another there, and possibly run up the valuation too heavily against the Government. As to Woolwich, there was less ground for complaint than elsewhere. Woolwich had been specially favoured. The question of revaluation came up, and the contention was that the arsenal was closely analogous to a large private manufacturing establishment, and ought to be rated on the same principle. The Government agreed, and, as had been done in no other case, an outside valuer—a gentleman from Manchester—was called in to assist the Government Valuer. Objections to the valuation were raised by the local assessment committee. They contended that the dockyard ought to be treated in the same way as the arsenal; but the Treasury properly resisted that contention on the ground that there was no comparison between the dockyard and private property. The result of the arsenal valuation was that the net rateable value had been raised by £15,000; and he, personally, believed that if, as the assessment committee had desired, a local valuer had been appointed instead of the gentleman from Manchester to assist the Government Valuer, there would have been no complaint at all. With respect to all Government, and especially War Office, property, the Government had steadily refused to allow local valuers to be employed. The War Office were exceedingly jealous of strangers being admitted to their premises, and even the Government Valuer had to obtain a special permission. If any one were allowed to visit the arsenals and dockyards, there would be an end of all secrecy. As to the appeal which was asked for, he would point out that the Assessment Committee had been thrown over by the Plumstead Overseers and by the Woolwich Local Board, who had written to the Treasury thanking the Government for the increase in the arsenal valuation, and saying that they had nothing to complain of. He had himself gone into the matter carefully, and he was satisfied that there was no grievance, as well as the hon. Member for Woolwich. He saw no reason for reopening the case.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that Plumstead had been dealt with in a most generous manner, and, therefore, it was not surprising that the overseers were satisfied. The arsenal had not been valued in a spirit satisfactory to the Woolwich Assessment Committee. The Woolwich Union did not receive an adequate return. He believed that the Woolwich Local Board had been induced to acquiesce in the Treasury arrangement on account of the pressure exerted by the Government Valuer. The Assessment Committee maintained that the arrangement was a very unfair one and they accepted it not without some discontent. They wanted to know the grounds upon which the valuation was made, and he thought that in fairness they were entitled to an opportunity for investigating the case of the Treasury.

DR. CLARK thought that if the Government paid rates like everyone else for watching and lighting they ought to get the cost of their own watching deducted as in the case of other large ratepayers. The local authorities could not have subventions from Parliament and at the same time require the Government to pay the same rates that other people were paying. He was glad, therefore, to hear that the Secretary to the Treasury intended to reconsider the matter.

Vote agreed to.

CLASS II.

5. £19,576, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices. Agreed to.

6. Motion made, and Question proposed:—

"That a sum, not exceeding £132,859, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) asked whether the President of the Board of Trade intended to take action on the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on the administration of the Mercantile Marine Fund, advising the reorganisation of the Fund. He noticed there was an enormous amount of money spent yearly in bringing home distressed British seamen from abroad; and he thought the House should be supplied with information as to the causes which lead to this expenditure. He would also like to know when it was likely the House would obtain the promised Return of merchant seamen. A Return had been supplied to the Departmental Committee on the Undermanning of Ships, but there was the greatest possible difference of opinion between various competent authorities as to its accuracy, and as the Registrar General of Merchant Seamen had better opportunities than anyone else for preparing such a Return, he hoped the completion of the one on which he was now engaged would be facilitated in every way.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES joined with his right hon. Friend in pressing for the Return of merchant seamen. He was quite unable to conceive on what methods the Returns of the Board of Trade, on this subject were prepared. They seemed to be got up anyway or anyhow. Certainly the Return of merchant seamen was absolutely delusive.

*MR. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe) said he must join issue with his hon. Friend on the subject of the Board of Trade Returns. A very remarkable instance of Board of Trade Returns had been published that morning in its Report on the loss of life at sea, which reflected marked credit on the Department. That Report had given the fullest details in admirable form, accompanied by several maps of a most artistic and useful character.

MR. RITCHIE said his hon. Friend the Member for Lynn Regis was always rather severe in his criticisms, but he did not always mean what he said. [*Laughter.*] He was sure the Returns which were prepared by the Board of Trade were prepared with the greatest care. With regard to the mercantile marine he could assure the right hon. Baronet opposite that as full a Return as possible was made, and the right hon. Gentleman admitted the difficulty of making such a Return as he asked for. He would, however, look into the matter and see what could be done. With regard to the administration of the Mercantile Marine Fund, undoubtedly the whole system was rather anomalous and out of date. He had hoped that it might have been possible to have dealt with the matter in the present Session, but such a reconstruction or reorganisation as was suggested could not be carried out unless they had a larger contribution from the Treasury, and that was not possible this year. He hoped, however, that he should be able to deal with the matter next Session, and, although he did not commit himself to every detail of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee, he hoped they would be able to proceed somewhat on those lines.

MR. LOUGH thought the President of the Board of Trade might have given more assistance to the Home Office in the dispute between the cabdrivers of the Metropolis and the railway companies. The Board of Trade was the Government Department which had to deal with the railway companies, and if the right hon. Gentleman would use his influence with them perhaps an amicable settlement might be arrived at. The cabdrivers and proprietors were all united now, and were most anxious to arrive at a settlement, but the railway companies by standing too stiffly by their rights and a little more than their rights had prevented it. With regard to the service of workmen's trains in the metropolis in the early hours of the morning there were one or two lines which treated the matter reasonably, but only one or two. The consequence was that the vast population of Londoners who travelled by these trains had to submit to great hardships. He suggested that the time at which these trains ran should be extended. He suggested that in the Return which was made of the trade of Great Britain and Ireland the trade of Ireland should be given separately. If this were done the value of this excellent Return would be greatly increased.

MR. WEIR asked whether any portion of the £800 which had been spent in fees and expenses under the Conciliation Act of 1896 had been spent in respect of the Penrhyn quarries dispute. He noticed that £2,800 was asked for the Light Railways Commission, and he wished to know if any of the light railways were in progress. He thought the salary of the right hon. Gentleman was inadequate—[*laughter*]—having regard to the many duties he had to perform. He called attention to the overcrowded state of railway carriages, especially in and around London.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS: That is a matter over which the President of the Board of Trade has no control.

MR. WEIR asked if the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to introduce legislation in order to bring about a better state of things.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said that was as much in the power of the hon. Member as of the Board of Trade.

MR. WEIR said he should have then to adopt other means of bringing the matter to the notice of the Department. He complained that the Patent Office took money without any inquiry, sometimes permitting 50 patents for the same article, and moved to reduce the Vote by the sum of £1,000.

[After the usual interval, the Chair was taken by Mr. JOHN ELLIS.]

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) joined in the appeal of the hon. Member for Islington to the President of the Board of Trade to renew his mediatory efforts in connection with the Privileged Cab question. The President of the Board of Trade had some Parliamentary control and some official regulation over the railways, and it seemed to him that if the right hon. Gentleman would again appeal to the managers of the railway cab companies he had not the least doubt that his efforts would be successful. The other day a director of one of the largest railway companies went so far as to say to him that if the cabmen would terminate the dispute and return to their situations as heretofore, he could almost guarantee that the railway companies would be prepared to make some settlement and some satisfactory compromise with the striking cab drivers. He believed that if this view was properly exploited by the President of the Board of Trade the dispute might be terminated on terms advantageous both to the travelling public and to the railway companies, and certainly satisfactory to the cab drivers. The reason he pressed this was because the railway companies, while declining to accede to the abolition of the privileged cab in railway stations, had been driven to adopt an interchangeable privileged cab system, which was in itself a step in the right direction. That should indicate to the President of the Board of Trade what the views of the companies were. It indicated that the privileged system had broken down, and had broken down, to some extent, with the concurrence of the railway companies themselves. He hoped the President of the Board of Trade would seize every opportunity of trying to persuade the railway companies to meet the men, and if they declined he should endeavour on his own initiative to do for the travelling public, by the abolition of the privileged cab system, what he had so well endeavoured to do for the Bethesda quarrymen. When he reminded the Committee that the cabmen had spent £20,000 on this dispute, he thought they would agree that that was an indication that they had some grievances, and when the fact was taken into consideration that the cab masters were on the side of the men, he thought he had shown sufficient reasons why an effort should be made to bring this dispute to an end as soon as possible.

MR. M. AUSTIN (Limerick, W.) desired to raise the question of the appointment of a correspondent for agriculture in Ireland. He put a Question to the President of Board of Trade on that subject last year, but although he expressed himself sympathetically, he believed that nothing had been done up to the present. The fact that out of the entire population of Ireland 78 per cent. were entirely dependent on agriculture showed there was a strong case for an independent correspondent for Ireland. From time to time reports had appeared in the *Labour Gazette* regarding the position of the agricultural labourers in England, Scotland, and Wales, but during the past four years only on two occasions had there been any direct reference to the exact position of the agricultural labourers in Ireland. It was very necessary that they should have a direct representative from the Board of Trade in Ireland. Under the present system the gentleman in England paid a cursory visit to Ireland, and made a report on the then existing condition of affairs, and that single visit did him for the entire year, but what would do in March would not do in September; and he asked the right hon. Gentleman that, as he required regular reports from England to be supplied to the *Labour Gazette*, he should also direct that an independent report of the agricultural condition of the labourer in Ireland should be supplied to the same journal. He would also point out that while four general reports had been supplied from Wales, not a single general report had been supplied from Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to see his way to appoint an independent correspondent for Ireland.

MR. T. LOUGH said that it would be interesting to have from the right hon. Gentleman what had been done under the Light Railways Act—how far the Board of Trade had approved of the applications that had been made under the Act, and how far it was working satisfactorily.

MR. DILLON said he wished to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the treatment of certain of the Wexford pilots. He understood that the Board of Trade had the power to pass certain Provisional Orders making alterations in pilotage districts, and sometimes these Orders very materially affected the vested interests of pilots. There was a Pilotage Provisional Order before the House this Session, and that had reference to the harbour of Rosslare. That harbour was only used by the steamers of one English company, and up to the present it had been necessary for any steamer going into that port to take a pilot on board. A Provisional Order was in the process of being passed by which the district was to be altered, and by which ships would be allowed to go into that harbour without taking a pilot. He was not concerned to argue the question whether that was right or wrong, but he wished to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it was fair to treat the Wexford pilots in this way? He was given to understand that the Order would very seriously affect their earnings. The Wexford pilots were 19 in number, and if the port of Rosslare, which was at the entrance of the Wexford harbour district, were freed from pilotage, much of the trade would be taken away from Wexford. He thought that, in the circumstances, it was only fair that the Board of Trade should make the Wexford pilots the ordinary allowance which in such circumstances was usually made. He would be glad to know what was the intention of the Board of Trade with regard to these pilots.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.) said he wished to make an appeal to the Secretary to the Treasury, or rather to the President of the Board of Trade, with reference to a very deserving though small number of public officials. He referred to those who were known as abstractors in the General Register and Record Office of Shipping and Seamen. They had to perform work of a by no means light class, which could not be done by men who had not a certain amount of experience and mental training. So far back as 1867 a Committee was appointed to deal with the organisation of this office, and they decided that the work done by these clerks, then called writers or verifiers, was such as was done by clerks of the lower division. In 1887 another Committee reported that the whole organisation of the office should be placed on the basis of a lower division office. In 1889 the authorities at the Treasury departed from the views of the Ridley Commission, and placed these clerks in the category of what were known as abstractors—in fact, made them, so to speak, a class by themselves. By this all they gained was a new name and a maximum increase of £9. It was true that they were also put on the Pension List, but their pension was a very visionary one, and in accepting it they had to surrender a claim which they had to a gratuity of £100. In 1892 or 1893 they presented a memorial to the Treasury, and in 1895 they went to the head of their Department, Sir Courtenay Boyle, and he frankly admitted that they were doing work similar to that being done by other clerks in the same office who received a very much higher salary. It was also admitted that their rate of increment was very small. Encouraged by this statement, they again asked the Treasury in 1895 to consider the advisability of opening a certain number of posts in connection with the Mercantile Marine Office to them. The grievance of these men was that, as public servants performing somewhat high-class clerical work, they might expect, after 22 years' service, to receive the magnificent stipend of £150. There were only 17 of them, and they were serving in an office with 30 other clerks, and the total cost of the office showed that the 30 senior clerks received in salary six times the amount received by these men. What they felt most acutely was that they could never rise to a higher position. He thought the Committee would admit that it was scarcely fair to keep a few men doing practically the same work as others at a lower rate of pay, and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it was not possible that something could be done to remedy the grievances to which he had called attention?

Mr. RITCHIE said that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had begun his remarks by appealing to the Secretary to the Treasury, and although he subsequently corrected himself and appealed to him, he thought that, on the whole, the grievances to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention were a matter for the Treasury. This case was another illustration of the fact that, although the House of Commons in the abstract always desired economy, yet in individual cases of this kind hon. Gentlemen were to be found urging on the Treasury an increase of pay all round. He did not dispute the fact that the gentlemen referred to were competent for the work which they did. At the same time he disputed the assertion that they were doing work which was the same as that done by others who were more highly paid. Even if it were so, that was a circumstance which occurred in every department of business. However conciliatory they might wish to be, it was impossible to go on raising salaries in the way that had been suggested. Two men might be sitting side by side at a desk and doing work which appeared to be very much the same kind of work; yet one of the men was a man who would anywhere command better wages than the other. As far as these gentlemen were concerned, it must be remembered that they were put in a better position than they at one time occupied. At one time they had no permanent employment, and were entitled to no pension. Now they had a permanency, and their salaries would rise to £150 a year. He did not hesitate to say that he should be glad if they received higher payment; but he did not know that the payment was inadequate for the work done, and certainly theirs was a better position than they were in a few years ago. The hon. Member for

East Mayo had brought forward the question of the pilots of Rosslare. Not having known he was going to refer to that question, and being unable to bear in mind all the details of a great Department like the Board of Trade, he was not in a position to give as sufficient an answer as he might desire. His impression was that the Board of Trade had little or nothing to do with the matter; it was a matter dealt with by the Pilot Board of the district, of which he believed the Board of Trade nominated one member.

MR. DILLON was sorry to interrupt, but both sides had been arguing out the matter before the heads of the Department at the Board of Trade during the past week.

MR. RITCHIE said no doubt the Board of Trade had some power, as they were bringing forward a Bill in the House of Commons; but he thought they were acting ministerially on local initiative. If the hon. Member had mentioned that there had been a conference at the Board of Trade on the subject he would have said what he now said—that he would make inquiries as to what took place with a view of endeavouring to see if anything could be done in the direction desired. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Islington thought he was not sufficiently severe on the railway companies. He should like to know what the view of the railway companies was. [*A laugh.*] He confessed that he did not attempt to be severe with them; that was not his function. He thought his duty was best done by being, if possible, on good terms with the railway companies. The powers of the Board of Trade over the railway companies were extremely limited; but he was bound to say that with hardly a single exception the representations they made to the companies were generally very fairly considered and very often their recommendations were acted upon, not because the Board had any power, but the railway companies knew that they could not afford to be indifferent to the wishes of a Government Department representing the public. He had no reason whatever to complain of the way in which the railway companies received the representations of the Board. They must all remember a recent case in which the intervention of the Board of Trade had the effect of preventing what would have been a deplorable strike. That intervention was in no way resented by the railway company; on the contrary, it was welcomed, and the result was highly satisfactory to all concerned. So that when the hon. Member talked about his not being sufficiently severe to the railway companies, he must remember that most of what they could do was by way of persuasion. With regard to the matter of the maps, he had already said that he thought it a matter of great importance to the trading community that they should be published as they were before, and he had every hope that the railway companies would accede to it. ["Hear, hear!"] Then with regard to the cab strike, to which reference had been made by the same hon. Member and by the hon. Member for Battersea. The latter had referred to the fact that he had during the strike made some representations to the railway companies. He confessed that he had some sympathy with the cabmen in the effort they made to get rid of the disability under which they laboured. He had a soft corner in his heart for the London cabmen. ["Hear, hear!"] They sometimes heard him much abused, though not so much in recent years as of old; but, as far as he was concerned, he had rarely met with a case of incivility in a cabman; on the contrary, he had often had occasion to be very much satisfied with the way in which he had been treated by them. ["Hear, hear!"] If he could have been of any assistance in the late strike, he should have been glad. He did communicate with the railway companies, but they stated that they could not accede to the men's demands without causing great inconvenience to the travelling public, and when a great company managing its own affairs made a statement of that kind, the head of a public department with no power to enforce his views could go no further. He knew that the Home Office endeavoured to bring about a settlement; and he was glad to hear from the hon. Member for Battersea that there was a disposition on the part of the railway companies, now that the strike was over and the battle won, to give terms that would be acceptable to the cabmen. If he could do anything to assist to that end, he should be glad if his good offices were available. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Islington asked for some information as to the operation of the Light Railways Act. The position was this. Twice a year, in November and in May, the Light Railway Commissioners considered the applications made during the previous six months. In the first six months the number of applications for light railways was about 36. Nearly all had been dealt with. Inquiries had been held in almost every case, and as far as he knew the results had been eminently satisfactory. To illustrate the working of the Act in the reduction of costs in connection with railways, he might mention that last Session a railway was applied for in the ordinary way and the Bill was withdrawn. The railway was to have cost £400,000. Application for the same line was made to the Light Railway Commissioners, and after a two hours' inquiry the scheme was passed; and the whole cost of the line and expenses, instead of £400,000, would now be only £60,000. That alone was a sufficient indication of the enormous advantage that was likely to accrue from the Act. ["Hear, hear!"] He was not quite sure how many applications had been received in the second period up to the present moment; but a month ago he understood that the number amounted to about 50. It would be seen that the Act was working satisfactorily and economically. There would naturally be some delay in issuing the first orders, because it was rather a complicated proceeding and it was necessary to be extremely careful in drawing up these first orders, as they would probably be taken as models for the rest; but there was no reason to think that any unnecessary delay would occur. He would be sorry to hold out any hope that the Department would be able to separate British trade returns from Irish trade returns, for he was informed that such a separation would lead to considerable complication of accounts, and would not serve any very useful purpose. He would, however, inquire further into the matter. The hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty had put various conundrums to him, and he would endeavour to answer them. The sum of £800 to which the hon. Member had referred was the amount which it was expected would be required to meet charges which might become payable in connection with the working of the Conciliation Act in the ensuing year. Then the hon. Member asked how he accounted for the increase in the amount taken for special services. The largest apparent increase was the item of £2,000 for fees and travelling and other expenses in connection with special inquiries. That was, in fact, a transfer from the Treasury Vote and not an increase. It was considered to be better financially that each Department should be answerable for the amount which it spent than that the Treasury should be responsible for the whole amount. The money was required for the purposes of the various Departmental Committees now sitting at the Board of Trade. There was also an increase of £730 due to the expenses incurred in connection with the transmission of seamen's wages from certain Continental ports. Under this system the wages were taken from the seamen and transmitted to their homes. That had been done at Dunkirk, and the result had been so satisfactory that it had been resolved to extend the practice to three other Continental ports. Everyone who desired the welfare of our seaport communities must be glad to hear of these arrangements. Then £600 was expenditure in connection with light railways. This expenditure would be made up for by the fees received. The hon. Member for Limerick had expressed dissatisfaction with the *Labour Gazette*. Differing from the hon. Member, he believed that the information given in the *Gazette* was very much prized, and was of great service. The hon. Member had asked him to appoint a Labour correspondent in Ireland. The circumstances in Ireland were, however, essentially different from the circumstances in England or Scotland. He had inquired into the matter, and he could assure the hon. Member that if he believed that the results which the hon. Member anticipated would follow from the employment of a correspondent in Ireland, he would gladly make the appointment; but from information received by the Board of Trade, he considered that the appointment would not have the valuable results which the hon. Member expected.

Mr. DILLON expressed satisfaction with the right hon. Gentleman's reply to his representations.

Captain NORTON said he maintained that one or two posts in the Mercantile Marine Office ought to have been given to the abstractors. It was true that they had not entered the service by open competitive examination, but they had proved themselves capable of doing the work.

Mr. RITCHIE said that the Board of Trade could not ride rough-shod, so to speak, over the rules of the Civil Service. It was not in the power of the Department to do as the hon. Member wished. He had, he found, omitted to notice one point which had been raised. He was surprised that any complaint should have been made with regard to the fees charged in the Patent Office. Those fees, as the Committee knew, had been largely reduced with the best results. They were now extremely moderate, and could not be said to bear hardly upon inventors. The scale of fees was arranged in such a way as made it extremely easy for an inventor to obtain his patent, and the present plan had given great satisfaction. He did not say that a time might not arrive when even still more liberal treatment might be accorded to patentees, but it was too soon as yet to contemplate a change. A considerable amount of money was being spent in improving the accommodation at the Patent Office, there being every desire to encourage inventors.

Mr. WEIR insisted that the Patent Office ought not to be a profit-making Department, and, as a protest against the existing system, moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000. The receipts of the Office were now £205,000, of which only £60,000 was spent in the office. There was therefore a profit of £145,000.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) thought it unfair that inventors should be penalised for the benefit of the revenue.

Mr. RITCHIE said that great care was taken to render it easy for an inventor to protect his patent. Any inventor who desired to protect his patent could have protection for nine months for £1. He could have four years' subsequent protection for £4, and as he went on he paid £1 for every year. Thus for £14 he secured protection for 14 years.

Mr. WEIR expressed the opinion that some examining body should be set up, so that a poor inventor might be informed whether his patent was of any value or not before he was involved in any further expense.

Colonel MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon) could not see that there was the slightest hardship in regard to the fees which were charged at the present moment. Patents, as they all knew, formed very valuable property, and they were extremely valuable to the inventor when they were worth anything at all. If the State received a small sum for fees on patents, he was sure that must be recouped many times over if the invention was a success. As far as the system of examination was concerned it was carried out in America, but not, he believed, to the satisfaction of the inhabitants. It was impossible for any board of examiners, however clever they might be, to state at once, or, for that matter, even after examination, whether there was not something which had escaped their attention, which anticipated the patent. There was no real cause of complaint, and he hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment.

Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) was also of opinion that the hon. Member for Ross-shire had no real ground to complaint. He had had a good deal to do with patents, and he knew that the fees which were paid for researches, etc., to patent agents, came to a great deal more than had to be paid to the Governmen. Very often those researches were eminently unsatisfactory, and he must say that a system whereby a man might pay a patent agent a large sum of money, pay a trifling fee to the Governmen, and then find the patent was not worth the paper it was written upon, because it had been anticipated, was not altogether satisfactory. With regard to what the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had last spoken had said about America, he had had to do with many American patentees, and they all seemed to be much better pleased with their own system than with that of this country. The great initial expense in patents did not come from the Government, but from the private investigations an inventor made himself before he found out whether his patent was valuable or not. He thought if the President of the Board of Trade could devise some improvement in this public Department whereby a patentee, poor or rich, could have some ground of security that his patent had not been anticipated, it would be one monument to the right hon. Gentleman's political memory which would last longer than many of the useful monuments he had himself erected.

Mr. BURNS observed that the hon. and gallant Colonel had hit one of the blots of the patent system, and had asked for a suggestion to remedy the extravagant prices which poor inventors had to pay to patent agents. At the present time, mainly through the lack of a register of patents properly undertaken by the Department and brought up to date, many workmen would go and pay their initial fee for provisional protection, would effect their patent, go back again, and through the absence of a register of patents which everyone ought to be able to have access to on payment of a trifling fee, would be lured on to develop patents which a register of patents would at once have shown them had already been anticipated. He would suggest to the President of the Board of Trade that he should consult with the chief of the Patent Office —a well-informed official—and see whether it was not possible, even at a cost of £1,000 or £2,000, to have a register of patents, by means of which protection could be given to many poor, and also rich, patentees, who would thus be saved from the sharks and patent agents who frequently made many hundreds of pounds out of rich inventors by urging them to continue patents and developments of patents which they would discontinue doing were the patent agents to tell them the truth, or the inventors to have the means of finding it out for themselves.

Question propsed, "That a sum, not exceeding £131,859, be granted for the said Service."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

7. Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £29,215, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for a grant in aid of the Mercantile Marine Fund."

Mr. WEIR urged the desirableness of having Norwegian lights fixed on the coast of Ross-shire. They were now in use on the coast of Argyllshire.

Colonel Denny.

Captain BETHELL (York, E. R., Holderness) asked whether the Board of Trade had nearly completed the communication between one lighthouse and another and the stations on the mainland, and whether electric communication with the lightships had been satisfactorily effected.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked for some information with regard to the electric communication with lighthouses, how far the system had gone, and what was to be effected in the ensuing year.

Captain PIRIE moved, as an Amendment, "That a sum not exceeding £25,000, be granted for the said Service." He referred to the establishment of electric communication between the lighthouses and the mainland. This experiment had now been going on for upwards of four years, and they had by no means reached finality. Every expert who had considered the subject and the Report of the Commissioners had shown that the experiment was most unsatisfactory and had led to no good result. The money would be better used to increase the number of lighthouses or fog signals so as to prevent accidents than in useless attempts to establish communication between the lighthouses and the mainland. The money spent on communication between lighthouses and the shore should be made to go as far as possible, especially as regarded Scotland. The Scotch coasts were notably deficient in lighthouses and fog signals. The secretary of Lloyds, writing to the Plymouth Chamber of Commerce, stated that the experience of Lloyds proved that the best means of diminishing loss of life round the coasts was the establishment of lighthouses and fog signals, which prevented casualties, rather than of telegraphic installations, which only availed after a casualty had taken place. Merchant shipping increased round the coasts of Scotland, and especially the north coast, every year. At present there was no fog signal between the Atlantic and Aberdeen. He moved to reduce the Vote.

Mr. RITCHIE said he understood the hon. Member to advocate that all means of electrical communication between lightships and the shore, for the purpose of signalling, should be abolished. His argument that the money should be spent on lighthouses was one that the

Committee should not consider. If more lighthouses were wanted they should be provided, but the question whether electrical communication was good or bad must stand by itself, apart from whether more lighthouses were wanted. The Royal Commission of 1892 recommended a large number of electrical communications on our coasts, which had since been completed, and other recommendations would be carried out without delay.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he could not understand that anyone who knew the situation in which lighthouses and lightships were should desire that they should be cut off from communication with the land. In the outlying sands on the east coast of England it would be the salvation of thousands of lives a year if there was electrical communication with the lightships. He suggested that the President of the Board of Trade might inform himself as to the interesting experiments which had been initiated by an Italian scientist for transmitting electricity without wires or apparatus along waves of ether. That was a direction in which some money might well be spent in the hope of avoiding prospective expenditure hereafter. He trusted the hon. and gallant Member would not persist in his proposal to give up the attempt to establish most necessary and useful communication between lightships and the shore.

Captain PIRIE remarked that if the Government would give an assurance that they intended to strike out fresh lines and investigate the recent discovery of Martoni he would be delighted to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. RITCHIE mentioned that £600 of the money asked for in the Vote was for experiments in connection with the system of communicating through space.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

8. £8, to complete the sum for Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade.—Agreed to.

9. £34,291, to complete the sum for Board of Agriculture.

Mr. CHANNING asked the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Department had considered the advisability of extending the facilities for the voluntary use of the tests which were applied in Denmark and France in regard to tuberculosis. The results of the experiments on the Continent certainly tended to establish the accuracy of the test in the great majority of instances, and its general adoption would enable agriculturists to distinguish between healthy and unhealthy animals in their herds. Whatever might be the report of the Royal Commission, there could be little doubt that the general adoption of the experiments, which had been carried out with some success by the hon. Member for Midlothian on his estate in Scotland, would result in enormous saving to farmers at comparatively little cost. Had the Department considered the advisability of not waiting till the Report of the Commission was issued and of providing the means of carrying out this test in different parts of the country under supervision by the Board of Agriculture? Such a step would be a great boon to agriculturists. Only a short time ago the president of the French Shorthorn Society had written to the president of the Shorthorn Society in Great Britain stating that English stock could no longer be imported for sale to France, because the breeders had refused to sell their stock under this test. At least one-fifth of the stock of the country was contaminated by this disease, and its extermination would mean millions of pounds in the pockets of English agriculturists.

Mr. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) said that as he introduced this subject to the notice of the House of Commons, and as the largest cattle market in the kingdom was in his constituency, he felt he had some right to speak on the question. It was only reasonable to wait for the Report of the Commission before expecting the Department to do anything. The test which the hon. Member referred to was quite as much a Local Government Board as a Board of Agriculture question. The chairman of the Commission was now busy preparing his Report.

*Mr. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Hereford) said that he wished to make a suggestion with regard to the cultivation of orchards. He suggested some time ago that a commission of inquiry should be instituted into the state of the orchards in the principal cider-producing districts of

England, and that the Government should establish certain experimental farms in those districts. As a result of these suggestions a gentleman had recently revived the cider industry in Kent, and last February celebrated there what was called "Arbor Day"—an institution well known in America, where it had produced the best results. Arbor Day was instituted in the United States by a private individual 25 years ago. The notion was warmly supported by the Government, and on the first celebration over a million trees were planted; and a great number each succeeding year, so that in some parts quite a change had been effected in the appearance of the country. The gentleman who had started the institution at the village of Eynsford, in Kent, had done so with the intention of promoting the planting of vintage apples and pears in that county. He (Mr. Radcliffe Cooke) was invited on the occasion, and after the trees had been planted a meeting was held, at which two resolutions were passed. One was:—

"That, in view of the importance of the cider industry to this country, and the capability of vastly extending it to keep pace with the growing demand for genuine English cider, this meeting urges the appointment of a Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the condition of our orchards all over the kingdom, and the establishment by the State of experimental farms for the cultivation and dissemination of approved varieties of vintage fruit."

The other resolution was:—

"That this meeting urges the importance of encouraging the planting in Kent of vintage varieties of apples such as were formerly abundant in the county, and the introduction of prime cider fruits, many of which are also excellent keepers and cookers."

Copies of the resolutions were sent to the President of the Board of Agriculture. They elicited the following reply:—

"Board of Agriculture,
"4, Whitehall-place, London, S.W.,
"26th March 1897.
No. 582/97.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Board of Agriculture to thank you for your letter of the 3rd inst., communicating to me resolutions adopted at a meeting, held at Eynsford on 'Arbor Day,' 27th ult., and I am to say the Board take note of the various views expressed. The Board are in hearty sympathy with any well-directed efforts which can be made for the improvement of orchards in this country, but they are not at present disposed to think that they themselves could, with advantage, take action in the particular direction indicated. The appointment of a Royal Commission would

scarcely appear to be required in order to bring to light the bad condition of certain apple orchards in the cider-making counties, and it is understood that the measures necessary for their improvement are already, as a rule, within the knowledge of fruit-growers.

"Nor do the Board think that the intervention of the State, with regard to the supply of young trees of good descriptions of vintage fruit would be well justified, inasmuch as such trees can readily be obtained at reasonable prices through the ordinary trade channels.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "T. H. Elliot, Secretary.
"E. D. Till, Esq.,
Priory, Eynsford, Dartford."

Sympathy was always largely kept in stock in the Government Departments—[*laughter*]—but, as the above letter showed, steps were invariably taken by the Department to find plausible reasons for not doing the thing they declared they were in complete sympathy with. The reply of the Board of Agriculture did not thoroughly satisfy the gentleman to whom it was addressed, and he wrote to the Board on April 1, 1897, as follows:—

"I thank you for your letter (582/97) by which I regret to learn that your Board are not able to take action in the direction of the resolution passed at the public meeting on February 27th. I have found extreme difficulty in obtaining good 6 ft. standards of both apple and pear of vintage varieties, and indeed had to place inferior sorts instead of the superior descriptions I wanted, such, for instance, as Foxwhelp, Dymock Red, Kingston Black, and Joeby Crab; neither could I get Barland nor Taynton Squash pear trees.

"If, with your wider experience, you will kindly tell me where good specimens of these or other proved varieties are obtainable, I shall be greatly obliged. I fear you take too favourable a view of the situation as regards supplies of young trees, except possibly from French nurseries.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"E. D. Till."

A month elapsed before any answer came to that letter. Meanwhile, Mr. Till had applied to all known dealers, and had found that the trees could not be supplied. The reply of the Board of Agriculture was as follows:—

"Sir,—I am directed by the Board of Agriculture to advert to your letter of 1st inst., and with reference to your request to be referred by this Department to fruit tree growers or dealers from whom you could obtain good specimens of young cider apple trees. I am to say that the Board do not see their way to depart from their practice of abstaining from selecting or recommending particular persons or firms."

The Board, therefore, took a month to state what the established practice of the Department was. [*Laughter.*] It was evident that the Board had endeavoured to find out whether the statements they had made in their first letter could be substantiated, and, finding they could not, the Board fell back upon "the established practice" of the Department. His friend, sending him the above letter, wrote:—

> "I enclose the reply of the Board of Agriculture. They abstain from recommending particular persons or firms! A rich excuse for ignorance."

When people applied to him for information as to where they could get good cider—as the Chairman of Committees lately did him the honour of doing—[*laughter*]—he sent them a printed list of addresses and let them make a choice for themselves, and if the Board knew where those trees were to be obtained they could have adopted some such plan as that. The only explanation was that when the Board made the statement they had no foundation whatever for it. On last Monday he received a letter from a Mr. Gray, an official in the British Consulate at Christiania—apparently a very intelligent and able young man. He hoped he would not injure the young man's chances of promotion by stating those facts in his favour. [*Laughter.*] This gentleman told him that a person of some importance at Christiania—in fact, a member of the body which in Norway corresponded with Parliament—was desirous of trying English cider. He had tried Norwegian cider, and did not like it. [*Laughter.*] But he was about to give a political dinner to his constituents—[*laughter*]—so that Members of Parliament had their trials there as well as here—[*laughter*]—and wanted some samples of the English article; and if he liked the samples he was prepared to propose that the duty now imposed on the importation of cider into the country should be reduced. Suppose he had written to this gentleman and said that to recommend makers of English cider was contrary to his established practice, what would have happened? Why, there would be no prospect of the introduction of English cider into Norway. He, however, gave the gentleman the name of a firm, and the samples he required were despatched to him. He had recently also had a request from a gentleman in Denmark to send him English cider, with a view to its introduction into that country. If these people had not happened to know of his humble existence they would naturally have applied to the Board of Agriculture, and if they had done so the Board, after waiting a month, would have replied that the practice of the Department would not allow them to give any such information. In that way the opportunity for the opening up of what might be a considerable trade would have been lost by the action of a Government Department. In America they acted in a very different manner, and in Canada also. He had suggested that the Board of Agriculture should establish experimental farms in this country. In the United States there were 50 experimental farms, and there were some in Canada also. To show the practical use of these farms he cited the case of the State of Iowa, where it was found that the winters were so inclement that the apple trees were often destroyed. The Government thereupon sent a director of agriculture, accompanied by a Canadian horticulturist, to Russia, where in one of the coldest provinces, the Province of Kasan, they found not only varieties of apple, pear, and plum trees which could be cultivated with profit in the cold climate of Iowa, but also forest trees which would give these fruit trees the necessary shelter. That was the proper sort of Board of Agriculture—["hear, hear!"]—and that was what the people here wanted. Experiments necessarily implied failure, and the ordinary farmer could not afford to run the risk of failure. The Government, however, could afford to run this risk, and there was no doubt that agriculturists in this country might greatly benefit by these farms All that the farmer had to do in the States, or in Canada, was to go or write to the experimental farms in order to find out what fruit trees he could plant with the best chance of success on his farm. Not only so, he could have at cost price whatever trees he wanted. The cost of these five experimental stations in Canada was £15,000 a year in a poor country, against England's miserable £7,000 or £8,000 a year. What he wanted the right hon. Gentleman to do was to follow the example of our Colonies, and ask the Treasury, not for £8,000, but for £80,000, a year.

Mr. MELLOR (York, W. R., Sowerby) observed that the last speaker had given the Committee some very useful information with regard to apple growing and cider making. He had a small matter which he wished to bring before the President of the Board of Agriculture, and it was this—he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not issue some circulars to the farmers in the west of England, not to induce them to plant fresh trees but to take care of the apple trees which they had got. ["Hear, hear!"] Nothing was more depressing to his mind than to go through the west of England now and to see the careless way in which these trees were being treated. The Board of Agriculture had done nothing in the way of giving advice to the farmers and labourers as to the best known methods of preserving their trees. This was a small but a very important matter, and he hoped the President of the Board of Agriculture would turn his attention to it. In the west of England the farmers thought very highly of Mr. Walter Long, and his name had a power greater than that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the Secretary to the Treasury, or anybody else. ["Hear, hear!" *and laughter.*] The right hon. Gentleman might also give his attention to the preservation of kestrels. These birds which were very useful indeed in the destruction of vermin were becoming very scarce, while complaints were arising from many quarters in the west of England as to the great increase of rats.

Mr. PARKER SMITH also supported the suggestion of the hon. Member (Mr. Radcliffe Cooke) and referred to experience in India. Reference had been made to the transit of animals from Ireland. The evidence which came before them went to show that animals suffered far more in crossing the Channel from Ireland than cattle which came from Canada. The Committee of which the hon. Member for Brixton was Chairman, paid special attention to the question of the transport of animals across the Channel. Reform was needed, and he hoped the responsible Minister could assure them that he had the matter under consideration.

Mr. DENIS KILBRIDE (Galway, N.) asked the President of the Board of Agriculture to say what had been done to promote agricultural and dairy education, for which provision was made in this Vote. More than one deputation had waited upon the right hon. Gentleman to ask him to introduce legislation which would put the law with respect to dairy-farming in a more satisfactory condition, because Irish dairy producers were seriously hampered by the present state of the law. Reference had been made in the course of the Debate to the serious loss incurred by farmers in the West of England by the depredations of rats. He had a valuable suggestion to make to the President of the Board of Agriculture. There was a little animal indigenous to Ireland—the Irish terrier—which was the best rat-killer in the world, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could do something to adjust the financial relations between Ireland and England—[*laughter*]—by spending some money in encouraging the breed of Irish terriers and sending the dogs to those parts of the West of England which were infested with rats. [*Laughter.*] If the right hon. Gentleman were willing to adopt that suggestion he could give the names of several breeders of the best rat-killers in the world. [*Renewed laughter.*] He approved of experimental farms, but he did not think that they ought to be confined to experiments in fruit-growing. They ought to cover every branch of the agricultural industry. One of the principal advantages that would arise from such a farm as that indicated by the hon. Member opposite would be that it would place at the disposal of farmers in different parts of the country the grasses that they should sow, having regard to the particular soil and climate of the district. The sum of £8,000 which they voted in this particular year was only a drop in the sea—it could do practically no good. He thought that £80,000, or even a much larger sum might be extremely well spent in improving the condition of agriculture. He thought everyone would admit that what agriculturists were suffering from was mainly ignorance. How was it that the dairy farmers of Denmark were beating out of the markets of London and other places the dairy farmers of Devon and Ireland—simply because the Danish Government spend a large amount of money every year on the agricultural expert education of their people, and in carrying out these experiments. To forward the agricultural interests of their people they had in this country a Danish Commissioner, an officer of the Government, paid by the Government, whose business it was to safeguard the interests of Danish produce all over Great Britain, and to report periodically to his Government which were the best markets for any particular kind of produce. Here the Government had done practically nothing up to the present time to teach the British agriculturist how to farm his land. He knew a great deal had been done to safeguard the health of the flocks and herds in this country. He admitted that a good deal had been done in the direction of stamping out the plague of tuberculosis and pleuropneumonia, but with the exception of that one particular piece of good the Board of Agriculture had done nothing practically to benefit the agriculturists of Great Britain, and nothing at all to benefit the agriculturists of Ireland. He found that little or nothing had been done either by the Board of Trade or the Board of Agriculture to improve the conditions of the transit of cattle from Ireland into this country, although there was no subject more worthy the attention of either Department. If right hon. Gentlemen would go down to any of the ports of this country and go on board ocean-going steamers which brought Canadian and American cattle to this country, and steamers which carried cattle between Ireland and England, they could not fail to be struck by the difference of the accommodation provided in the two cases. The Irish cattle traffic would never be satisfactory until some Government Department insisted that cattle boats should be cattle boats, and passenger boats passengers boats. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR C. DILKE, referring to the remarks of the hon. Member for Hereford (Mr. Radcliffe Cooke), said he thought it was very doubtful whether it should be left to a private individual to foster an industry like the cider industry, which he believed had a large future before it. He had been requested by a large number of his constituents to mention to the President of the Board of Agriculture the bearing of the muzzling order on the working of sheep dogs. They hoped that it would be possible for the right hon. Gentleman to make some modification in the order in favour of sheep dogs, as it was found very difficult for these dogs to work properly now.

MR. G. WHITELEY (Stockport) said that the complaint he always had to make against agriculturists was that instead of adopting the methods of other trades, instead of working out their own salvation, and themselves conducting the experiments necessary to develop their industry, they were always calling upon the Government to do something for them, and to spend money on their own particular industry. He did not think it was desirable that their demand for £80,000 should be agreed to at present. Last year the Government gave a sum of £2,000,000 to the agriculturists, and surely that should suffice for some little time. From rates to rats was an easy transition, and he was sorry to hear that rats were making such depredations in the West of England. He thought the best thing would be to issue an order that all rats should be muzzled. [*A laugh.*] He thought that would meet the case.

*MR. WALTER LONG said that the hon. Member for Northamptonshire had asked whether the Board of Agriculture were prepared to take any action of their own in anticipation of the Report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis. The Report would be, he believed, in their hands before long, and, pending that Report, he was certainly not prepared to make any recommendations as to Government interference in reference to this question. The hon. Member told the Committee it was a very serious question, and if it were so serious, it would certainly be a very hazardous thing for any Government Department to take steps affecting the agricultural community, unless they had behind them the recommendations of the Commission and the evidence upon which those recommendations were based. The suggestion of the hon. Member was that they should act somewhat in the same way as the Local Government Board acted in the supply of lymph—that they should supply tuberculine for voluntary use by agriculturists. That was a suggestion which he might entertain if it were shown to him that at present there was any practical difficulty in the way of agriculturists, if they wished to make experiments, obtaining the necessary means. But he saw no evidence of any such practical difficulty. For instance, the work done by the hon. Member for Midlothian without Government assistance was of the greatest possible value to his brother agriculturists, and reflected the greatest credit upon him. Pending the Report of the Royal Commission, he was not prepared to suggest that any definite steps should be taken by his Department. ["Hear, hear!"] He thought the majority of the recommendations that had been made to him had been in connection with experimental farms. No doubt there was a great deal to be said for experimental farms, but he was quite sure there was something to be said against them. He did not envy the lot of a President of the Board of Agriculture, who was responsible for them. He did not know what his lot might be in the various assemblies to which his hon. Friend behind him had referred, whether in the Colonies or in foreign countries. But he did not envy the lot of a President of the Board of Agriculture in that House who was responsible for the conduct of eight or ten experimental farms in different parts of the country. He knew that it was no easy matter to satisfy British agriculturists on any particular question; but he was quite certain of this, that if the Government conducted experimental farms with a view to showing farmers how to farm their land, the practical result would be that every agriculturist in the House or out of it would tell them that "whatever they did know, they did not know how to cultivate land"—[*laughter*]—and nothing but disastrous results would be attained. He confessed that he listened with regret to the ready way in which hon. Gentlemen in all parts of the House and in all parts of the country were found to talk about British agriculture as if it stood at the bottom of the list with regard to the agricultural products of the world. To listen to some of them, one would think that British agriculturists were the most ignorant and incompetent in the world. Whereas he did not think there were any producers in the world with whom the British agriculturists could not compete, both in the quantity and in the quality of his produce—["hear, hear!"]—and be believed that he was able to put on the market an article superior to that produced by any country in the world. How was this excellence obtained? And that it had been attained he had never heard gainsaid. Had it been by Government assistance? Had these experimental farms in other countries enabled those nations to produce a better article than we produce in England? He cared not whether it was their brethren in Canada, or the agriculturists of foreign countries. Take any kind of produce—potatoes, cheese, butter, crops of all kinds—take them either in quality, size, or general character—the British agriculturist had always more than held his own. That had been due, not to Government experiments or Government interference, but it was the result entirely of his own energy and initiative, and the risking of his own capital. [*Cheers.*] His hon. Friend behind him was anxious that they should undertake experiments in growing cider apples. He understood the suggestion was that they should set up experimental farms in order that upon them there should be grown a particular kind of apple, so that this kind of fruit tree might be supplied to those who applied for them. He was sorry that in the correspondence which had taken place on this subject, either the hon. Member or his Friends should have had to complain of any delay on the part of the Board of Agriculture in replying to their letters. But he was bound to say that this was the first time he had ever heard it laid down in that House that it was the primary duty or in any sense the duty of a Government Department to supply the public with the names of shops where they could get an article of the best character. Further than that, he could not conceive anything more undesirable or more to be avoided than that a Government Department should identify themselves with the advertisements of particular wares or manufactures, or of shops where these could be bought. ["Hear, hear!"] His hon. Friend dwelt on the difficulties in the way of getting these particular fruits. Yet he told them that in Kent a certain farmer had revived this expired industry with most successful results. Surely they could do in

Hereford what had been done in Kent. He could not believe that the cider industry, if it was not a prosperous one already, was going to be carried on to a success if it could not be developed without a Government Department setting up fruit gardens. A dozen or more other industries were constantly brought under his notice as being suitable subjects for experiments on special farms. But there was no other country in the world that varied so much in respect of soil and climate as England did, and what might be suitable for production on one experimental farm would be unsuitable in another. Therefore, to meet all the suggestions that were made from 20 to 30 experimental farms would be required. Complaint had been made that only £8,000 a year was spent here by the Government on agricultural education, as compared with £100,000 spent in Canada; but it should be borne in mind that here it had been resolved to work in the first place not through the Government but through private enterprise, which was only to be supplemented by the help and action of local authorities in the shape of County Councils. When hon. Members said that nothing had been done by that House or the Government to assist agriculture by finding money for experiments and for improvements, they forgot or ignored what the House had done. Not long ago £160,000 a year was voted for technical and agricultural education, and that money was expended by the County Councils. Let hon. Members ascertain whether the duties entrusted to the County Councils were properly performed; and if they were not, let hon. Members take steps with a view to making the County Councils spend the money in a more useful way. It could not be said with truth that the Government had not provided money for these purposes. He was not a believer in the system of experimental farms carried on by the Government, but he did believe in experimental farms attached to agricultural colleges and similar institutions, and he would gladly do what he could to assist educational centres, county councils, or great agricultural colleges to obtain land in order that practical instruction in agriculture might be given to students. He agreed that it was unfortunate to find how greatly orchards had been neglected in many parts of the country, and he would consider the advisability of issuing a circular or leaflet on the subject. He deplored the destruction of kestrels and owls. Their annihilation was unsportsmanlike and injurious to the farmers' interests, because they destroyed many agricultural pests. A leaflet had already been issued on this subject by the Board of Agriculture, but he would see whether anything more could be done. In regard to the transit of cattle from Ireland, he was glad to say that there had been a distinct improvement. Last year he secured the assistance of four additional inspectors, who had been hard at work ever since their appointment. There was room for further improvement, but he was not at all sure that the damage entirely was done in the cross-channel stage of the journey. He and the Chief Secretary for Ireland were at the present moment engaged in an inquiry into this branch of the question, and with the aid of the officials concerned they hoped to be able to obtain information which would enable them to see if it were not possible to effect such changes in the transit of cattle as to secure that they were carried humanely, and also delivered in a condition that would insure their commanding the best prices. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean had mentioned certain matters of detail in connection with the muzzling of sheep dogs. The matter should have his attention, and he hoped soon to be able to communicate with the right hon. Gentleman. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. CHANNING remarked that the leaflets which had been issued by the Board of Agriculture had proved of great value to agriculturists. He should like to ask the President of the Board if he could see his way to include among them a translation of the very interesting and suggestive report of Professor Bang, the great Danish expert in tuberculosis. When he was in America he found that this work had been issued through several States of the Union, and that it gave in a careful and concise form the results of experiments which were of great service to agriculturists.

*Mr. LONG said he would be glad to consider the suggestion.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported—

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expenses of and relating to arbitration which may become payable under any Act of the present Session to amend the law with respect to compensation to workmen for accidental injuries suffered in the course of their employment, and of any compensation that may become payable in respect of accidents to workmen employed by or under the Crown in pursuance of such Act."

Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Monday next.

LAND TENURE BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

TENANT RIGHT IN TOWNS (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Friday 25th June.

LONDON WATER COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday next.

BOARDS OF GUARDIANS AND LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading [7th April] further adjourned till Thursday 1st July.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

COUNTY COUNCILS (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

VERMINOUS PERSONS BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

SALE OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

TRAWLERS' LICENSING BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

POOR LAW FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 24th June.

LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS BILL.

Read a Second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

PARISH REGISTERS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday next.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 1st July.

WHITSUNTIDE HOLIDAYS.

On the Motion "That the House do now adjourn,"

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY said: At Question time I threw out a suggestion in regard to the holidays and the possible necessity or desirability of suspending the Twelve o'clock Rule in order that our holidays might be extended to June 17th instead of only to the 14th. I have made such inquiries as I can in different quarters, and I find that on the one hand there is a strong objection to suspending the Twelve o'clock Rule, and that, on the other hand, there is a general desire to get through the work of the Committee stage of the Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill as soon as possible. Under these circumstances I do not propose to take any steps on Monday next. ["Hear, hear!"]

Adjourned at Five Minutes after Twelve o'Clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 31st May 1897.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I wish to be allowed to say a few words of personal explanation with respect to a remark made on Friday evening by the noble Viscount who spoke from the Cross Benches immediately after I moved the adjournment of the Debate. My noble Friend is reported to have said "he should say that the wild Irish had been got at." Now, my Lords, some centuries ago, according to an old chronicler, Irishmen were divided into "mere Irish, wild Irish, and very wild Irish." As a native of the Pale my noble Friend would be classed as "mere Irish," and would naturally look upon a poor Connaught man like myself as "wild Irish." I cannot complain of that; it was probably only from extreme politeness that he refrained from including me among the "very wild Irish." But I do not quite know what he meant by saying "the wild Irish had been got at." If, however, he meant to convey a suspicion that my Motion was at the instigation or with the concurrence of Her Majesty's Government, or prompted in any way by any previous communication with them, I wish to assure the House and assure him that his suspicion is a wild one—I may say a very wild one. In point of fact, when I mentioned my intention in conversation with a Member of the Government a short time before my turn came to speak, it was received with so much surprise as to leave me in considerable doubt as to whether the Government would agree to my Motion or not. I beg to thank the House for allowing me this opportunity of stating that the wild Irish have not been "got at," and that there was nothing underhand about my Motion on Friday.

VISCOUNT CLIFDEN: My Lords, I am very sorry if anything that I said displeased the noble Lord. It was certainly not him to whom I referred. Whether he is wild Irish or very wild Irish I leave to others to say. What I did think and now repeat is that, as far as I was concerned, it was sprung upon us at the last moment that the Debate was not to go on. How that was arranged I think the noble Viscount knows better than I do. When I came into the Lobby I was told the Debate was not going on. I am sorry we did not proceed with the Debate, which I do not think we shall hear this year, but I still say that an arrangement was made of which many of us were not cognisant until we came into the House.

FLOODS PREVENTION BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to give further powers to County Councils with a view to the prevention of floods and other damage arising from rivers or watercourses—Was presented by the Lord Thring; Read 1^a; and to be printed.—[No. 102.]

COPYRIGHT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

*LORD MONKSWELL, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said it was a little Bill on a big subject, and he was rather doubtful whether its small scope would recommend it to the House. Some of their Lordships were no doubt familiar with the Report of the very strong Royal Commission which sat in 1878 to inquire into the then condition of the law of copyright. That Report contained a scathing denunciation of the then state of the law, both as to form and substance, and probably their Lordships would be of opinion that nothing would meet the case except a Bill of very wide scope indeed. He entirely agreed in that, seeing that the Report of the Commission showed that the law then existing was a disgrace to the Statute-book. In its main features the law had been in force for 55 years. Much of the principal statute was unintelligible, though during that long period numerous judicial decisions had been given which had enabled authors and publishers to take a more accurate view of their rights; but a great many points in the Act still remained obscure and undecided. During that long period of 55 years, persons for whose benefit the Act was passed had spent a great deal of their literary gains in litigation, and a good many had probably spent a good deal more than their literary gains in endeavouring to ascertain their rights under the Act. In these circumstances he thought that authors had a right to complain of their treatment by Parliament. The Legislature ought long ago to have passed a consolidating and amending Act, and nothing short of such a Measure could be accepted by authors in full discharge of the debt due to them from Parliament. But authors, like other people, must take Parliament as they found it, and if they could not get what they considered to be their due, they must ask for what they thought they could get. In the fierce competition for legislative favour and even justice, authors, he thought, laboured under some disability as compared with other classes of persons. Though it was exceedingly regrettable, it was not surprising that their just claims had been ignored by both Houses and both Parties. They were not well versed in the art of agitation. The great majority of them were not keen party men, and many were not party men at all; and he supposed that when a General Election came about there was no class of persons among whom there had been less disposition to go to the poll. They were not a very numerous class. There was, no doubt, a particular class, namely journalists, who were keen politicians, but they were less affected than other literary men by the law of copyright, for they generally wrote for the day alone. Authors would have to become much more proficient in the arts of the demagogue before they induced Parliament to pass a complete measure of reform. The attempt had been several times made, but the result had been by no means encouraging. The last attempt was made six years ago, when the Society of Authors, then led by the late Lord Tennyson, honoured him by asking him to introduce a Bill of a very comprehensive character to amend and consolidate the law. The same noble and learned Lord who now occupied the Woolsack occupied it then, and he was very much startled by the magnitude of the task which he endeavoured to impose on the House. The noble and learned Lord acknowledged that the law was in a shocking state, and consequently allowed the Bill to be Read a Second time, but on the condition that it should be proceeded with no further. He acknowledged to the full that there was a great deal of force in the arguments of the noble and learned Lord, for not only was the Bill then introduced a very large and comprehensive Measure, but it dealt with matters very much in dispute both as to colonial matters and matters of foreign policy, and it affected to a great extent America, Canada, and the Berne Convention. Therefore there was great force in the contention that a Bill of that character should be taken in hand by the responsible Government of the day. Since that time both sides in politics had been in office, and neither had shown the slightest inclination to take the matter up. It therefore appeared to the Society of Authors that having waited in vain for six years, the only way in which they could bring this matter prominently before the public and Parliament was by presenting a Bill. He would very much have liked to introduced a larger Measure, but had he again done so, the same arguments would have been used against him as were used six years ago. This Bill was of a totally different character, and he hoped their Lordships would not only give the Bill a Second Reading, but would view it favourably in its later stages. The Bill was a very small one in the sense that it was very short, but it dealt with several important matters, but matters of purely domestic concern. It did not affect the Colonies or foreign countries, and had nothing to do with the Convention of Berne. The Bill did not affect any question in which the Colonies were specially interested; he could not imagine that any Colony or British possession would object to be placed under the Bill; but if they should, there was a provision in it which met the case, for by Order in Council the Government of the day was to have the power of deciding whether or not any particular British possession should or should not come under the Bill. The Society of Authors placed great faith in their Lordships' House. They believed that quite independently of the other House their Lordships could do a great deal of good towards promoting the cause of copyright reform. If the Bill should pass their Lordships' House, he proposed that it should be sent to a strong Select Committee, upon which Lord Knutsford, who was a member of the Commission of 1878, had promised to sit. The Measure was by no means an author's Bill, although promoted primarily by the Society of Authors. Its provisions had also been carefully considered by the Publishers' Association and the Copyright Association, who were in the main satisfied with them. He trusted that a Bill that conciliated so many diverse interests would be considered as deserving of consideration. The Memorandum explanatory of the Bill divided it into five parts, the first of which dealt with the question of magazine copyright, as to which the law was very obscure and much in need of reform. No one pretended to know with certainty what the law was, but the better opinion appeared to be that there was no copyright in a magazine article for a period of 28 years, that a publisher could only print the article as part of his magazine, and that the contributor could not reprint it during the period which he had mentioned except by consent of the publisher. In practice the publisher generally did give his consent after a much shorter period, and all the Bill would do would be to bring the law into conformity with the almost universal practice. The change effected would be retrospective, and it was proposed that an author should be at liberty to republish a magazine article in separate form at the end of three years. This would be in accordance with the views of the Copyright Commission. It was not proposed to interfere with the copyright of the publisher of an encyclopædia, who would still retain his present rights over its contents. The Bill also proposed that a lecturer should have copyright in his lecture without its being necessary for him to give notice to two Justices of the Peace. A further provision made lectures and sermons delivered in endowed buildings subject to copyright. That was a proposal not in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, but the Society of Authors believed that they would be able to adduce good reasons for it before the Select Committee. The Bill dealt next with the question of abridgement, and, in accordance with the Report of the Royal Commission, proposed to enact that copyright should carry with it the right to abridge. The unauthorised dramatisation of a novel would be made an infringement of copyright, and the author would be provided with a simple remedy. The Measure would throw upon the British Museum the duty of certifying the date of the first publication of a book. It was necessary to ascertain the date of such publication, because the period of copyright ran from it, but at present it was often difficult to ascertain the date. It would be seen that this was not an ambitious Measure. It merely dealt with defects in the law, and the removal of those defects would bring welcome relief to a class of persons who were peculiarly entitled to the consideration of their Lordships' House. ["Hear, hear!"] He begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (The Earl of DUDLEY) said that he did not rise to criticise the provisions of the Measure, or to oppose its Second Reading. He feared, however, that he could only consent to the Motion on the same condition as was made by the Secretary for Scotland in 1891—namely, that the Bill should not be proceeded with further during the present Session. The whole subject of copyright was in a very unsettled state, and negotiations were being carried on respecting it between this country, the colonies, and foreign countries, and until those negotiations were completed, it was obvious that a Bill of this kind could hardly have the effect which was desired. He thought it also obvious that, if a subject of this kind was to be dealt with at all, it ought to be dealt with as a whole, and not in a piecemeal fashion. The noble Lord appeared to think that neither the present Government nor the Government of which the noble Lord was himself a member, had shown any disposition to take this subject in hand. With regard to the present Government, that supposition was not correct, and the Board of Trade would be quite ready to introduce a Bill, dealing not only with the amendment of the copyright law, but also with its consolidation, when the negotiations to which he had referred had been completed. In these circumstances, he trusted that if the Bill was read a Second time the noble Lord would forego his intention of referring it to a Select Committee.

LORD THRING thought the condition on which the noble Earl was willing to allow the Bill to be read a Second time was a most extraordinary one. Lord Monkswell had explained clearly that what the Bill proposed to do was simply to touch the fringe of a very large subject. The Bill would not interfere in the slightest degree with the great law of copyright in books. What it would do was to amend the law affecting lectures, sermons, and the dramatisation of novels. These were matters independent of and separate from the general question of copyright. They required minute and detailed investigation, and if the Government were to allow these points to be examined by a Select Committee, there need be no interference whatever with the Measure which the noble Earl said he would be prepared to introduce at some future time. On the contrary, the consideration of this Bill by a Select Committee would pave the way for the Government Measure, and remove obstructions from its path. He had never heard a more inconclusive answer than that given by the noble Earl. Here was a Bill to amend a certain definite part of the law; its consideration would not hamper or fetter in the least the action of the Government with respect to the rest of the law on this subject; and he quite failed to understand why the Measure should not be proceeded with.

LORD HERSCHELL said that he took a great deal of interest in this subject, because he was a member of the Royal Commission of 1878. Next year 20 years would have elapsed since the publication of their Report, and up to the present time it had produced no result. He feared that if they were to wait for legislation until a complete and comprehensive Measure was introduced and passed, the 20 years during which those who were interested in this subject had been compelled to wait, would have a considerable addition to their number. He did not see why this Bill should not be referred to a Select Committee in order that its provisions, which did not really go to the root of the copyright question, might be considered carefully and put into the best possible shape. That surely might be done, even if the Bill could not be passed. One reason why the settlement of this question had been delayed so long was that some of our colonies had raised objections from time to time to legal alterations which would affect them. One might almost say that there had been some friction between Colonial Governments and the Government of this country with regard to copyright laws extending to the colonies. But he did not think that these difficulties afforded any ground for not proceeding further with the consideration of this Measure now. It seemed to him that the matters with which the Bill dealt might be treated very much apart from the general question of copyright law, and that it would be a useful work for a Select Committee to inquire what was the best shape in which they could be put. So far from creating any difficulty with regard to the Bill which probably the Government might introduce, it would be of immense assistance if these separate and detached questions could be carefully considered by a Select Committee. They could then embody, if the results appeared satisfactory, those provisions in their Bill, or after seeing all that was to be said by the Select Committee they might make alterations or abandon any part of them. It struck him, therefore, that the consideration of this Bill by a Select Committee could not interfere with any negotiations that might arise with the Government in afterwards framing a Bill. He called attention to two provisions in the Bill that would require attention and further consideration. The first was the provision relating to the dramatization of novels. It made it an infringement of copyright without the consent of the author to take or embody the title of a book or colourably take from the book a substantial part of the dialogue. So far he thought that there would not be much difference of opinion. The Bill also made it an infringement to take or colourably take a part of the plot or incidents of the novel. But plot and incidents were very often to be found which were very similar in their character in more than one novel, and, supposing they found the same plot in two novels, was the owner of the copyright in each of the novels to be able to treat the adaptation as an infringement of his copyright? If so, then they might have several persons complaining of a breach of copyright in respect of one and the same drama. That was a part of the clause which would require further consideration. The other was an important point. He sympathised with the scheme as to the time when copyright began; but there was a difficulty in ascertaining when copyright had begun and when publication had taken place. The proposal was to make a certificate of the British Museum operative as to the time from which copyright had to run. Every author, no doubt, was bound to send a copy of his book to the British Museum under a penalty, but he was not sure that the effect of the provision had been thoroughly considered. Unless a person publishing in this country sent his book within a month he was liable to a penalty of £5. But supposing an author delayed to send beyond the month the only result was that he subjected himself to the penalty. If the copyright was to run from the date when the author first transmitted the book to the British Museum, obviously it might be of advantage to the owner to extend the period of sending his book to the British Museum. Six months' extension of copyright might be more valuable to him than the penalty of £5. If the book was published outside the United Kingdom, in another part of the British dominions, it need only be sent to the British Museum within twelve months of publication. In that case a book published in the colonies, if sent, say, at the end of the eleventh month, would allow the colonial author to obtain practically an additional year's copyright over the person who published in the United Kingdom. Therefore, the clause, though excellent in intention, might probably with some additional provisions be made capable of affording a satisfactory solution of the time of publication; and those were matters which might be carefully considered when the Bill was further discussed.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) thought that the subject was one which would be, to some extent, assisted by the deliberations of a Select Committee. [*Cheers.*] He was not in the position to give his noble Friend any undertaking that the Measure would be passed into law this Session, because he thought that there was a great deal in it which required discussion. He thought that their Lordships would do well to read the Bill a Second time now, though, looking at the date at which they now were, he was afraid that there was not a great chance of actual legislation this year. He agreed that the deliberations of a Select Committee might assist both their Lordships and the other House in dealing with this subject on some future occasion. [*Cheers.*]

Bill Read 2^{a}, and referred to a Select Committee.

JURIES DETENTION BILL.

Read 3^{a} (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

ELEMENTARY ERUCATION ACT 1870 AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3^{a} (according to Order), and passed.

VOLUNTEERS BILL.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read, and discharged.

WHITSUNTIDE RECESS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: May I ask the noble Marquess when he proposes that the adjournment should take place, and for how long?

THE PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of SALISBURY): If quite convenient to noble Lords opposite, I should propose to adjourn on Thursday until the 18th.

House Adjourned at Ten Minutes past Five o'Clock, till To-morrow, a Quarter past Ten o'Clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 31st May 1897.

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Wednesday till Wednesday 30th June.

QUESTIONS.

COVENT GARDEN THEATRE FUND.

Mr. J. F. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Parliamentary Charity Commissioner whether it would be possible for the Charity Commissioners, without interfering in any way with the operations of the Covent Garden Theatre Fund as a benefit society regulated by statute, to inquire and ascertain how far it is fulfilling the functions of its other capacity as a source of relief to distressed widows and orphans of the theatrical profession?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster, Isle of Wight): I have recently been informed that, owing to the charity in question being a friendly society, the Charity Commissioners have no jurisdiction. From a statement made to me I am clear that inquiry is necessary into the management of this society, and I will take steps to see that such inquiry is made.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Mr. JOHN DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on the Irish Land Commission, and the names of the Commissioners?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) said he was not yet able to make any statement on the subject.

Mr. DILLON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give them any indication as to when he might be able to make a statement?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said he was afraid he could not do that.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Tipperary (Mr. Patrick J. O'Brien), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that there has been no sitting of the Land Commission for the district of North Tipperary within the past twelve months, that there are in consequence a large number of cases on the list in the neighbourhood of Nenagh, Borrisokane, Cloughjordan, and other places; and if he can say how soon may the parties interested expect to have their cases disposed of?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: A Sub-Commission sat for the hearing of cases from the Unions of Roscrea, Nenagh, and Borrisokane, at the end of last October. A further sitting was held at Roscrea on the 29th of last January, and at Birr on the 30th April last. The hearing of a list which contains cases from the Union of Nenagh was commenced at Kilkenny on the 25th instant. A sitting for the Union of Borrisokane will be arranged for at as early a date as possible consistent with the claims of other districts. There are at present comparatively few cases unlisted from these Unions.

Mr. JAMES GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Castletownsend estate, County Cork, is to be sold; and, if so, whether valuers from the Land Commission will visit it with a view to estimate the value of the agricultural holdings, and advance the full amount of the purchase money to the present occupiers?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The estate referred to has, I believe, been advertised for sale in the Land Judge's Court. The Land Judge has declared, however, that Section 40 of the Land Act of last year does not apply to this estate.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. T. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Postmaster General has the power to invest the funds of the Post Office Savings Bank in local loans, securities, and debentures of high class English railways; if so, whether this power has been taken advantage of, and to what extent; and, if not, whether he will consider whether the granting such a permission would assist the Postmaster General in maintaining profitably the present rate of interest paid on the deposits, and relieve the difficulties created by the constant purchase of Consols?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.): It is the duty of the National Debt Commissioners to invest this money, and the power of investment does not extend to any of the securities named in the Question, except Metropolitan stock. I think the extension of the power to such securities would be open to serious objections; and that their market price would be so much raised by it that the profit which the hon. Member anticipates would in all probability not be secured.

TELEPHONE SYSTEM (PETERBOROUGH).

MR. R. PURVIS (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, having regard to the fact that the Secretary of the General Post Office promised, by letter of the 22nd of last July, to give careful consideration to the claims of Peterborough to be made one of the towns connected with the system of telephones by trunk wire communication, the Postmaster General is now prepared to so connect that city with the system?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. R. W. HANBURY, Preston): A further application, dated the 17th instant has been received from the Town Clerk, and is being considered at the same time as the question of the connection of Peterborough with the trunk telephone system. The Postmaster General regrets that he is not yet in a position to say whether the large expense which, he finds, would be involved, would be justified. But when the Inquiry is completed he will communicate with the hon. Member.

CIVIL SERVICE (CLERKS).

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the regulation as to compulsory retirement at the age of 65, embodied in Clause 10 of the Order in Council of 15th August 1890, is intended to be applied to all clerks both of the higher and second divisions now serving in the Civil Service; whether he is aware that one of the clerks now serving in the office of the Registrar General, Scotland, with 40 years' service, is over 70 years of age, and by what authority a clerk of that age is retained in the service in view of the regulation referred to; and whether appointment to the class of district examiners in the office of the Registrar General, Scotland, is made by promotion from the second division or by the nomination of the head of the Department from persons outside the Civil Service; whether any second division clerks have actually been appointed to this class; and whether, on the occurrence of vacancies therein, the claims to promotion of the second division will be considered?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Order in Council of 15th August 1890, applies only to the higher division of the Civil Service. The clerk referred to, who is a diligent and useful officer, and quite efficient, is not in the higher division, and therefore does not come under the regulation as to compulsory retirement. The appointment to the post of district examiner is in the gift of the Secretary for Scotland and the persons selected have been sometimes from within and sometimes from without the office. The selection may be made from persons either inside or outside the Civil Service, but on the occurrence of a vacancy the claims of the second division clerks to promotion will be carefully considered.

HERRING BRAND FEES.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate what amount of surplus revenue accrued in Scotland from the herring brand fees from 1858 to 1880; and has any part of this surplus been applied to purposes connected with the fishing interest; and, if not, will the amount be now paid over to the Scottish Fishery Board to provide harbours needed on the coast of Scotland?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The Treasury decided in 1858 to retain the official brand for herrings provided it was made self supporting. There are, as the hon. Member will find on a perusal of the Estimates, many instances of appropriation in aid of the expenses of Departments which include official salaries. I see no reason for changing the present arrangement.

BOARD OF REVENUE (MADRAS).

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the proceedings of the Government of Madras of July 1895, revising the Settlement Manual and Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue, together with the Correspondence which led to such revision?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing): Having communicated with the Government of India, I am afraid I cannot promise to lay on the Table of the House the Papers referred to in this Question.

ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY.

Mr. BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for War whether, during the recent annual practice of D, E, and J Batteries, R.H.A., at Okehampton, out of the eighteen new 12-pounder cordite guns of 6 cwt. that were employed, no less than eleven of them became useless after firing only a few rounds, owing to broken elevating gear; whether these three batteries, D, E, and J, are the first for service in the First Army Corps; and whether, at Shoeburyness, a year ago, the Commanding Officer of one of these batteries made a strong report as to similar accidents which were happening then from the same cause?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.): It is the case that eleven of the nuts of the elevating gear in D, E, and J Batteries, R.H.A., broke during firing at the recent annual practice. These nuts were made of phosphor bronze, and until last year no instance of failure occurred, although tried for two years. When one broke last year it was not considered sufficient to condemn all those in use with the new Horse Artillery equipment. As, however, there appeared to be some doubt of the phosphor bronze standing, a number of nuts of manganese bronze were manufactured to replace them if necessary. When the recent failures occurred these manganese nuts were put on, and should they prove satisfactory, the whole of the guns will be provided with them. By the fracture of this nut the gun is only temporarily out of action till the broken nut has been replaced by the battery artificers. The three batteries alluded to are in the First Army Corps.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN AFRICA.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government have now suggested to the Powers a Conference of the Powers signatory of the Brussels Act, or of the Powers possessing territory in Africa, on the subject of the African liquor clause of the Brussels General Act, or other subjects connected with that Act?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. George Curzon, Lancashire, Southport): Her Majesty's Government are in communication with the Belgian Government as to the best means for bringing about a discussion between the Powers interested with regard to the regulation of the liquor trade on the West Coast of Africa.

SCOTTISH FISHERIES BOARD.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he will explain why nearly £5,000 per annum, on account of the salaries of the permanent establishment belonging to the Scottish Fisheries Department, is charged upon fees paid by the fishing industry; whether a similar charge is imposed on account of salaries of permanent officials in other public Departments; and whether this charge will for the future be remitted?

*The LORD ADVOCATE: The total amount of brand fees collected between 1858 and 30th December 1880 was £123,700, while the estimated cost of collecting these was fixed by the Treasury at £89,700, leaving a surplus of £34,000. This sum was lodged in Exchequer, and was not revoted to the Fishery Board for harbour and other purposes, as has been the practice since 1880.

Mr. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, seeing that in the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland it is stated that a further representation has been made to the Russian, Austrian, and United States Governments on the subject of reducing the high import duties on cured herrings, will he state on what date those Governments were respectively approached, by whom, and with what result?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: Representations were made in the end of last year and in the beginning of this, through the usùal diplomatic channels, but no response has as yet been received.

POST OFFICE (ADULT MESSENGERS).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the scale of pay of adult messengers in the General Post Office has not been revised during a period of 35 years, and, having regard to the fact that their position both as to pay and prospects of promotion is far worse than it would have been had they remained in the branches from which they were specially selected, will he consider the expediency of arranging for some substantial improvement in their position?

MR. HANBURY: The scale of pay for adult messengers in the General Post Office, which has remained unaltered, as the hon. Member states, for 35 years, has now been revised on the recommendation of Lord Tweedmouth's Committee, and runs from 24s., by 1s. 6d. to 40s. a week, instead of from 21s., by 1s. to 40s. These officers voluntarily entered their present class, and it is impossible to go into the question whether they would have been better off had they remained in other branches of the Service.

ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE (STORNOWAY).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, having regard to the fact that the largest Naval Reserve station in the kingdom is at Stornoway, island of Lewis, and that no provision is made for the Reserve men in case of accident, will the Admiralty consider the advisability of making some contribution to the Lewis Hospital at Stornoway, seeing that it is the only hospital in the island where accident cases can be received, and is moreover maintained entirely by voluntary contributions?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): No case of injury requiring hospital treatment has occurred among Royal Naval Reserve men drilling at Stornoway since the Lewis Hospital was built. In the event of any man being hurt and requiring hospital treatment he would be sent to that hospital, and the usual rate of 2s. a day would be paid for his maintenance. There is no reason for making a special contribution to the hospital.

ARTISANS' DWELLINGS (LONDON).

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in the Parish of Hackney the rate collectors, acting under directions of the Board of Inland Revenue, are, under 53 Vict. cap. 8, s. 26, requiring owners of houses who have obtained exemption from rates under that Act to furnish a fresh certificate of the medical officer of health before continuing the exemption so acquired, notwithstanding that no change whatever has taken place in the circumstances of such houses as regards valuation, accommodation, or otherwise, but merely on the ground that a new quinquennial valuation has been made for London; whether he will take steps to enable owners to continue in receipt of the benefits of the Act, as provided by the Act, without being required to obtain such fresh certificate; whether he is aware that the medical officers of health are not remunerated for the services rendered by them in granting such certificates, and are consequently unwilling to execute these duties, and owners consequently find it difficult to get the benefits of the Act; and whether he will take steps to render the operation of the Act more easily available to the public?

*MR. HANBURY: Section 26 of the Act, 53 Vict. cap. 8, does not exempt for all time the premises (Artisans' Dwellings) to which it applies. It provides that the assessment to the House Duty shall be discharged by the local Commissioners on production of a medical officer's certificate to the effect that the house is so constructed as to afford suitable accommodation for each of the families inhabiting it, and that due provision is made for their sanitary requirements. The assessment is made annually, and therefore a certificate ought strictly to be produced annually. It is not, however, the practice to require a fresh certificate except on the occasion of a new quinquennial valuation. The hon. Member assumes that no change has taken place in the accommodation or the sanitary provision necessary for the various families inhabiting such a house, but it is evident that structural alterations might be made, and that even if no change in that respect took place, the question of suitable accommodation and sanitary provision must depend upon the number and size of the families, which are constantly changing. As regards cases where no change of any kind has taken place, it is possible that, owing to the advance of medical science, a tenement might be condemned to-day which would formerly have been passed as sanitary, but I do not see how it could be seriously contended that the privileges of the Act, which are expressly limited to sanitary tenements, could be extended to cover such a case.

SWANSEA GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Sir JOHN DILLWYN-LLEWELYN (Swansea Town): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Thirsk, as representing the Charity Commissioners, with reference to the old Grammar School at Swansea, which has been converted under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act 1889, into an intermediate and technical school, whether he is aware that for 200 years previously to 1894 it was a Church School, and that in 1872 a sum of about £500, derived from private subscriptions, was expended in adapting and decorating the chapel, which is now dismantled and used as a gymnasium; and whether the Commissioners will endeavour to induce the Education authority to restore to their former owners the lectern, Communion plate, and other church ornaments which have been removed under the scheme?

Mr. GRANT LAWSON (York, N.R., Thirsk): In considering the scheme in this case, submitted to them under the provisions of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act 1889, by the Joint Education Committee of the County Borough of Swansea, the Charity Commissioners were of opinion that the school did not fall within the protection accorded to denominational schools by that Act and by the Endowed Schools Act, and this view was upheld by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in an appeal against the scheme. The Charity Commissioners have no information as to the expenditure of the particular amount mentioned in the Question, nor as to the existence of the plate and church ornaments there mentioned. It is stated, however, in the Judgment of Lord Herschell in the case mentioned above, that a sum expended between the years 1872 and 1876 in converting a crypt under the dining-hall of the school into a chapel had become so mixed with the old endowment of the school as to withdraw it from the general protection given to modern endowments by the Endowed Schools Acts. If, as seems probable, the plate and other articles mentioned are also subject to the scheme, the Commissioners have no power to bring about their restitution.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (JUNIOR EXAMINERS).

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury (1) whether the question of the continuance of the present system of appointment to the class of junior examiners in the Education Department, and the desirability of recruiting that class by means of open competition, have been considered by the Commissioners of the Treasury; (2) whether their Lordships have ever called upon the heads of that Department to fill vacancies occurring in that class by means of the Higher Division examination conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners; and, if so, on what grounds the Department have refused to comply with such request, and whether these grounds appeared satisfactory to the Commissioners of the Treasury; (3) whether the Higher Division examination referred to is adopted for recruiting the Higher Division staff of both the Colonial Office and the Treasury; and (4) whether the Commissioners of the Treasury are satisfied that the duties of junior examiners in the Education Department are so superior to those of Higher Division clerks in the two other offices mentioned that they could not be satisfactorily performed by men obtained by the same method?

Mr. HANBURY: The question of the best system for appointing examiners in the Education Office has not been formally raised for many years—not, I think, since 1871. The Treasury have not taken the step suggested in the second paragraph because they have no power to compel an independent Department to adopt the method suggested. The Higher Division examination is adopted for recruiting the Higher Division staff of both the Colonial Office and the Treasury. But it was stated by my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council on May 21 that the duties of the junior examiners in the Education Department are not analogous to those of clerks of the Higher Division, and could not properly be performed by them.

NAVY *(PERSONNEL).*

MR. ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the 100,000 men which appear on the Estimates as being on the Active Service List, include the 6,300 men some of whom began service on the 1st April last, and all of whom will not have joined till the 1st April 1898; and whether, in addition, the 100,000 includes 7,932 persons included under Vote A, but are not available for manning services?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY: The Question of the hon. Member conveys the erroneous suggestion that the Estimates state that 100,000 men were on the Active Service List. If the hon. Member turns to Vote A, he will see that the heading gives the numbers of all ranks for whom provision is made, *i.e.*, 100,050. This provision includes the necessary amount of pay for the 6,300 by which the numbers are to be increased during the course of the financial year. The hon. Member will also see that the same page of the Estimates clearly shows that of the 100,050, a certain number of men and boys would not be immediately available for sea service, being instructors or under training or performing administrative duties.

LITTLEDALE ESTATE (CO. WICKLOW).

MR. D. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Wicklow (Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that the Secretary of the Irish Land Commission has informed Mr. James Byrne, an evicted tenant of the Littledale estate, that the landlord having objected to his application to purchase his holding, no further proceedings could be taken in the matter; (2) whether the Land Commissioners have received an offer of purchase from a man named Ellison; and (3) whether the Commissioners are in communication with Ellison with a view to the sale to that person of the farm from which James Byrne has been evicted?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Commissioners are not in correspondence with Ellison, and no proceedings are pending with a view to the sale to him of the holding from which Byrne was evicted.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has taken into consideration the first Report of the Select Committee on Museums of the Science and Art Department; and, whether he is prepared to state what course the Government propose to adopt in order to protect the collection at South Kensington from the danger pointed to in that Report of injury or even total destruction by fire?

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works what steps he proposes to take to protect the contents of the South Kensington Museum from the immediate danger of fire; and whether, in view of the gravity of the interim Report of the Select Committee, the Government will at once proceed with the erection of the necessary new permanent buildings for the Museum?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am afraid I can at present only refer the hon. Baronet and my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea to the answer given to a question on this subject on Friday last by my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury. With regard to the Report of the Committee, I desire to say that it was presented without the Treasury or the Office of Works being invited to furnish evidence in the case.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanark, Partick): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the prices charged to Civil Servants for seats to view the Jubilee procession will leave any surplus after defraying the expenses incurred in providing the seats so paid for?

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: It is not anticipated that there will be any surplus.

Mr. PARKER SMITH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he proposes to make any provision for Civil Servants to witness the Jubilee Naval Review?

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY: One hundred and fifty tickets have been issued for distribution to representative members of the Civil Service.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Officers of the Army in India at present on leave in England have been afforded accommodation to view Her Majesty's procession on the 22nd June; and, if so, how many seats have been allotted to them?

*Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The seats to view Her Majesty's procession on June 22 placed at the disposal of the India Office for the Civil and military services of India have been allotted to those in this country who were considered to have the best claims without regard to the question whether they are at home on leave or otherwise.

Captain NORTON had given notice of the following Question:—

> "To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it has been brought to his notice that in the churchyard of St. George's, Southwark, tombstones are being disturbed in order to make room for a stand to view the Jubilee procession, the church itself being used as an office for letting seats; and whether he will use his influence to put a stop to these proceedings, which are distasteful to many of the inhabitants of the surrounding district."

The hon. Member explained that information had reached him that the displacement of tombstones was not so serious as he had been led to believe, and in these circumstances he did not propose to ask the Question.

Mr. G. C. T. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Chairman of the Kitchen Committee (1) by whose authority 21s. is charged for tickets for luncheon on the 22nd June; and (2) whether, especially as the premises, fuel, table fittings, and many other charges are paid for out of Votes from this House, a more moderate luncheon, say 5s., excluding wine, may be provided?

Lord STANLEY (Lancashire, Westhoughton): The charge has been settled by the Kitchen Committee. I regret it would be impossible to carry out the proposal suggested in the second part of the Question. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]

Mr. BARTLEY asked whether those hon. Members who could not afford to pay a guinea were to bring their own luncheons—[*laughter*]—and by whose authority was Westminster Hall to be closed on that day to hon. Members unless they paid for a ticket?

Lord STANLEY: By the permission of the First Commissioner of Works. [*Cries of* "Oh!"]

Mr. BARTLEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for Tower Hamlets, Stepney (Mr. Wootton Isaacson), I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether Her Majesty's Government has come to any decision as to the advisability of meeting the wishes of the inhabitants of the East End of London by allowing the Colonial and Indian troops, accompanied by bands, to march through some of the main thoroughfares, decided on by the War Office, on one occasion during the Jubilee week?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): This is a more difficult Question than appears at first sight. The Jubilee procession will involve much fatigue on the Colonial and Indian troops; and it will be undesirable to give them much extra work either immediately before or after the principal day. On the other hand, the Secretary of State recognises the reasonableness of the suggestion, and he will do what he can towards complying with it.

JURORS CHALLENGED (CO. TYRONE).

Mr. JAMES DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state how many jurors and the religion of each juror that was challenged by the Crown at the trial of the Maguire Brothers in County Tyrone in March last?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Forty-one jurors were ordered to stand aside by the Crown and forty challenged by the prisoners. No inquiry is made into the religion of jurors, nor am I in possession of any information on the subject.

MURDER OF YUSAF YUNAN.

MR. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the sentences passed on the murderers of Yusaf Yunan have been carried out; whether any compensation will be paid to his wife and family; and whether Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople will be instructed to demand from the Porte the full restitution of the stolen relief money, in view of the statement contained in the letter addressed by the Foreign Office to the Secretary of the Armenian Relief Fund, to the effect that only £20 have as yet been recovered?

MR. CURZON: Our latest information is contained in a Dispatch from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, dated the 13th instant, in which he states that the sentence of death passed on the murderers had been referred to the Court of Cassation at Constantinople for confirmation, and that he had instructed the legal adviser of Her Majesty's Embassy to watch the proceedings when the case came on for trial. The question of claiming compensation to the wife and family of the murdered man must depend on whether there is substantial proof of negligence or complicity on the part of the Ottoman authorities. As to the relief money said to have been in the possession of Yusaf Yunan at the time of his death, it appeared that in spite of the efforts of Her Majesty's Vice Consul at Bitlis the whole sum till then recovered amounted but to £20 odd. His Excellency added that he was addressing a Note to the Porte on the subject of the relief money, as distinct from that of the murder.

MR. STEVENSON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a Report has been received at Her Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople from the American Mission Superintendent at Mardin, stating that evidence has been produced at a local inquiry made with a view of ascertaining the cause of the murder of Yusaf Yunan, to the effect that the Mutesarif of Sert and a subordinate official procured a forced loan of relief money?

MR. CURZON: Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople forwarded last month a memorandum by Mr. Andrus, of Mardin, giving details respecting the murder of Yusaf Yunan, but there is nothing in that report to the effect that the Mutesarif of Sert and a subordinate official procured a forced loan of relief money.

PARISH COUNCILLORS (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he will state for what period a parish councillor must have resigned his seat before it is competent for him to make an application for an appointment under the parish council; and if no period is fixed, will he consider the advisability of fixing a short limit of time?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: There is no statutory provision fixing a time within which it shall be incompetent for a Parish Councillor after resigning his seat to apply for an appointment under the Parish Council; and it has not been brought to my notice that any disadvantage has been experienced under the present arrangement.

INSPECTORS OF POOR (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether, as in the last Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland allegations of a serious nature are stated to have been made against 15 inspectors of the poor, and that the Board was called upon to investigate eight charges against medical officers, he will state in what counties the inspectors of poor and medical officers were employed?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: To supply the information requested would be an entire departure from ordinary practice, and would not, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, be to the interests of sound administration.

CANADIAN MAIL SERVICE.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any objection to stating the conditions attached by Her Majesty's Government to their approval of the provisional agreement entered into between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and Messrs. Peterson, Tate, and Company for the establishment of a fast Atlantic service; and whether Her Majesty's Government have fully satisfied themselves as to the competency of Messrs. Peterson, Tate, and Company to carry out the contract on a subsidy so considerably smaller than that deemed necessary by firms of much longer and greater colonial shipping experience?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The contract is between the Dominion Government and Messrs. Peterson, Tate, and Company, and I will ascertain whether they object to its publication at present. The Dominion Government have informed me that they fully satisfied themselves as to the competency of the contractors to carry out their engagement.

ARMY STAFF OFFICERS (INDIA).

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, on what principles appointments to the Staff of the Army in India are made; and what are the numbers of Staff officers employed with that Army who come under the following heads respectively: officers trained at the Staff College; officers trained by practical experience in campaigns; and officers without special training for Staff duties?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Speaking generally, an officer is eligible for appointment to the Staff in India if he has four years' service, has passed the necessary examination in the native languages, has gone through the Staff College, or has passed the qualifying examination laid down in Indian Army Regulations, or has proved his ability in the field. Subject to these conditions, the selection of officers for Staff employ rests with the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India.

CAPTAIN PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the total number of appointments on the Army Headquarter Staff, Command Staff, and District Staff of the Army in India; and the number of such appointments which are held respectively by Officers P.S.C. and by Officers not so qualified?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Excluding personal staff, and the staff for Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and musketry instruction, there are 142 appointments on the Staff of Army Headquarters, Army commands, and districts; of these 36 are held by officers who have passed through the Staff College and two are vacant. The rest are held by officers who have not passed through the Staff College.

CAPTAIN PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the number of Officers P.S.C. of the Indian Staff Corps who are employed on staff duty at present, also the number of the same who are not so employed, and the average period for which these latter have remained without such employment after qualifying for it by passing through the Staff College?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: There are at present on the active list 30 officers of the Indian Staff Corps who have passed through the Staff College; of these 20 are in Staff employ, five are commanding their regiments, and five are employed regimentally. I cannot say how long these officers have remained without Staff employment.

MILITARY PRISONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to a book entitled "Scarlet and Steel," written by Mr. E. Livingston Prescott, which alleges that corporal punishment is administered in military prisons; whether such corporal punishment has been administered since the passing of the Army Act 1881, for the abolition of flogging in the Army; and, if so, did it form part of the sentences of the courts martial; and, if not, by what authority were the prisoners flogged; and, whether he has any objection to give a Return of the cases of corporal punishment inflicted in military prisons, Home and Foreign, since 1881?

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside) asked whether it was not a fact that the Return previously presented to Parliament showed that the number of prisoners flogged in military gaols exceeded, in proportion, the number of prisoners flogged in the civil convict establishments throughout the country.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid I cannot give the hon. Member for Tyneside the comparison, but in 1895, out of 4,361 prisoners, five received corporal punishment. My attention has not been drawn to the book referred to, which is, I understand, a romance and not a statement of facts. The discipline of military prisons is carried out under the supervision of the Home Office. In all military and civil prisons there is, under stringent restrictions, provisions for corporal punishment in case of serious prison offences. The regulations for military prisons are presented to this House under the 133rd section of the Army Act; and all cases of corporal punishment are recorded in the annual report of the Inspector-General, which is presented to Parliament. A Return, showing the number of prisoners flogged in military prisons at home during the last six years was presented on the 25th inst.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would grant a Return of the prisoners flogged in military prisons abroad?

MR. BRODRICK said he saw no objection to such a Return being granted.

MR. LIONEL HOLLAND (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the book referred to was written by a lady who had had no experience of military prisons.

MR. BRODRICK said he was not aware of that.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked whether these floggings always took place in the presence of the Governor?

MR. BRODRICK: Yes; they are carried out under the most stringent regulations.

BERRIEW SCHOOL SCHEME.

MR. A. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomery): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Thirsk Division whether, in the event of the Berriew School scheme being laid upon the Table and rejected, the sum of £224 0s. 10d. now standing to the credit of the Berriew School in the books of the Montgomeryshire County Governing Body, will sink into the General Fund, from which it was originally derived, or will be dealt with by a scheme of the Charity Commissioners; and, in the latter case, on what principles such scheme may be expected to be framed?

MR. GRANT LAWSON: In the events which have happened the sum in question appears to have been severed from the General Fund, and there appears to be no provision in the Montgomeryshire County Scheme which can operate to bring the sum back to that fund in the event mentioned. In that event it will become impossible to apply the sum in question in accordance with the County Scheme, and it will be proper that a *cy-pres* scheme for its future administration should be made by the Charity Commissioners. If the Charity Commissioners shall receive a sufficient application for such a scheme they will provide in framing the scheme that the interest of the Berriew District constituted by the County Scheme shall be regarded.

FERMANAGH SCHOOL ESTATE.

MR. P. C. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what decision, if any, the Commissioners of Education have arrived at with reference to the sale of their Fermanagh School Estate, in separate farms, to the existing tenants?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No definite decision has yet been arrived at by the Commissioners, who are in communication with the tenants as to the terms upon which they are prepared to purchase their holdings.

LLANBEDR SCHOOL BOARD.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Committee of Council have decided to make the parish of Llanfair, in North Wales, contributory to the Llanbedr School Board; whether he is aware that there is an efficient Voluntary School in Llanfair; and whether there is any reason why Llanfair should be made contributory to Llanbedr School Board; if so, what that reason is?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir JOHN GORST, Cambridge University): The Committee of Council have issued an Order making Llanfair contributory to the Llanbedr School Board in respect of certain Llanfair children, who are obliged to attend the Board School owing to the distance of the Llanfair National School from their homes. The contribution will be for maintenance only; and the Order fixing the amount payable by Llanfair will be so drafted as to relate only to such Llanfair children as may, from time to time, be on the books of the Board School.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Can the right hon. Gentleman state how many children will go from the parish of Llanfair?

SIR J. GORST: I cannot state without notice.

LABOURER'S COTTAGE (STRABANE).

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether an application under the Labourers' Acts has been made in the case of Robert Matthewson, of Coolaghy, Feddyglass, in the union of Strabane; and, if so, when; whether Matthewson's house was condemned by the medical officer as unfit for human habitation; whether orders for the building of cottages within the union of Strabane were given under the authority of the Local Government Board; and, if so, at what date; and if Matthewson's case was included, what is the reason of the delay in building?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: An application was made by the person named to the Board of Guardians in 1894. The Medical officer condemned his house as unfit for the accommodation of his family, and as otherwise being in a bad condition of repair. Orders for the erection of, altogether, 30 cottages were made by the Local Government Board on the 19th January, 1895; 25th February, 1896; and 11th May, 1897. The Order made on the 11th inst. contemplated the erection of a cottage for the labourer referred to, but as petitions may be lodged against the Order up to the 11th of June, the inspector, who is carrying out the Acts in the union, is not yet in a position to proceed with the scheme.

LONDON, TILBURY AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY COMPANY.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is able to state if the Great Eastern and London, Tilbury and Southend Railway Companies are prepared to remove the increases of 12 to 45 per cent. upon manures, which form the subject of a complaint which has been pending before the Board of Trade since 19th May 1896?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. C. T. RITCHIE, Croydon): At the instance of the Board of Trade the Companies will revert to the old rates; the Department has also represented to the Companies the desirability of removing the increase as from the 1st January 1893, and anticipate that this will be done.

RAILWAY DRAWINGS AND RELICS.

MR. F. A. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that old designs, drawings, prints, and relics illustrative of the stages of railway development in the United Kingdom are being bought up by American and French engineering agents for the proposed Museum at Chicago and the French Exhibition of 1900; and whether he will recommend to the Treasury the purchase of the more important of these objects, with the view of supplementing and completing the collection at South Kensington, and forming a National Railway Museum?

MR. RITCHIE: I am afraid I cannot make any such general recommendation to the Treasury as that desired by the hon. Member. No doubt my right hon. Friend will carefully consider any suggestion put before him.

PNEUMATIC MESSAGES.

SIR LEWIS McIVER (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will consider the feasibility of introducing into London the system of pneumatic messages which works so satisfactorily in Paris and Berlin?

MR. HANBURY: The question of the establishment of a pneumatic post in London has been more than once under consideration, but the Postmaster General and his predecessors have not seen their way to recommend the very large expenditure which would be necessary to the construction of an efficient system.

Sir LEWIS McIVER asked whether there were not now in the east and west central districts of London a sufficient number of pneumatic tubes to enable an experiment to be tried?

Mr. HANBURY said he was aware there were several tubes, and he would inquire whether an experiment could be made.

IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, what additional payment has been asked by the London and North Western Railway Company for the desired acceleration of the day mail trains from Euston to Holyhead, and vice versa; what amount is the Post Office paying for the four Irish mail trains between Euston and Holyhead; and what additional sum was charged for the acceleration of the night mail trains?

Mr. HANBURY: The London and North Western Railway Company at first asked £11,000 a year for the acceleration of the night and day trains. There was no separate offer in respect of the day trains. It is impossible to state the payment to the Company for the four Irish Mail Trains, as they were provided for under contracts covering other services, and no apportionment of the total sum was made between the various services. After negotiation the sum actually charged for the acceleration of the night mail trains was £5,150 a year.

ARMY FOOD AND FORAGE SUPPLIES.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin (Mr. W. Field), I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office (1) whether the War Office has as yet concluded inquiries regarding the supply of foreign meat, hay, and oats to the troops stationed in Ireland; and (2) whether it is intended to give native supplies in future?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The officers who have the matter in hand hope to submit a Report very shortly. The Inquiry is complete as far as Ireland is concerned. The answer to the second Question must depend to a large extent on the nature of the Report made to the Secretary of State.

Captain DONELAN: Can the hon. Gentleman say whether the new meat contracts, which I understand will be in shortly, contain any new condition with reference to the supply of foreign meat to troops in Ireland?

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I hope the Report will be in the hands of the Secretary of State in time to enable him to receive any recommendation that may be made before the new tenders are given out.

MASHONALAND.

Mr. H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the disturbances in Mashonaland, he will now lay upon the Table, and cause to be circulated, Sir Richard Martin's Report on the Administration of the Chartered Company; and, if not, whether he will state in furtherance of what public interest the Report is withheld?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The Question of the administration of the British South Africa Company is, in fact, *sub judice.* The Report in question has been laid before the Select Committee, and there are obvious objections to making public disconnected portions of the evidence laid before the Committee on matters of a controversial character.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): May I remind my right hon. Friend that some weeks ago he was good enough to say that if I requested him to produce this Report he would produce it as soon as the Chartered Company had had an opportunity of making their comments upon it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My recollection does not go as far as a promise, but I certainly did undertake to consider the matter. The reply of the Chartered Company has not yet come to hand, but I am informed it will be handed in some time after the Whitsuntide holidays. I have, however, reconsidered the subject, and I really think there would be the greatest inconvenience in a matter of this kind in publishing portions of the evidence before the Committee which they themselves have not yet considered. We have the Report of Sir Richard Martin, but he himself admits that the character of the evidence on which he has to rely is most unsatisfactory, and his conclusions are disputed by the Chartered Company. So altogether it is a matter of an extremely controversial character on which the Committee will have to give their judgment. Under these circumstances I think it would be quite unusual to produce the Report before the Committee Reports.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I think my right hon. Friend contended on the previous occasion that it would be contrary to precedent, but I submit this deals with an isolated aspect of the question. I wish he would reconsider the matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I will be glad to speak to my right hon. Friend.

INDIAN POLICE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India on what ground natives of India are excluded from competing in the examinations held in London and Calcutta for the higher offices in the Indian police; and on what grounds the house allowances, amounting in the aggregate to Rs.90,000 per annum, granted to European and Eurasian telegraph masters and signallers in India, are withheld from natives of India holding the same appointments?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As regards the Indian police officers recruited in this country, it is thought, in view of the nature of their duties, to be essential that the conditions for admission to compete should be identical with those for commissions in the British Army. As regards those who are selected in India, a discretion is allowed to each separate Government, and, as at present advised, I see no reason to call in question the manner in which they have exercised it. I have no knowledge of the distinction which the hon. Gentleman alleges to be drawn between Europeans and Eurasians on the one hand and natives of India on the other, but I will make inquiry on the subject.

WESTMEATH (APPOINTMENT OF SHERIFF).

Mr. JASPER TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether the Executive Government have sanctioned the appointment of the present sub-sheriff of Westmeath; (2) whether he is aware of the circumstances under which this gentleman ceased to be an official of the Bank of Ireland, a previous high sheriff having refused to re-appoint him to his present position; and (3) whether the Irish Executive are satisfied of his fitness to discharge the responsible duties of levying and collecting the sums granted under decrees of Irish courts of justice?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The sub-sheriff is appointed by the high sheriff, who is responsible for his conduct in his office. The sanction of the Executive is not required to the appointment of this office, nor does the Executive inquire into his fitness for the office. I have no knowledge of the matters referred to in the second paragraph.

GRANARD UNION.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the grounds on which the Local Government Board have annulled the appointment of Miss Walker as night nurse in Granard Union, and whether ladies with similar qualifications have been sanctioned in the neighbouring unions of Longford, and also in unions in the north of Ireland?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Miss Walker, aged 22 years, and without previous experience in nursing, was elected by the Guardians at a salary of £10 a year. The Local Government Board have now informed the Guardians that they cannot sanction her appointment until they receive a report from the Workhouse Medical Officer stating that, in his opinion, she is qualified to discharge the duties of night nurse. The Board have added that if the Guardians persist in their refusal to secure the services of a trained nurse, the Medical Officer may requisition such additional nursing assistance as he may require. The night nursing in Longford Workhouse is in charge of the Sisters of Mercy who are nurses in the Workhouse, the duty being undertaken in rotation by these Sisters. The Board have repeatedly addressed Boards of Guardians relative to the necessity of appointing only trained and experienced persons to take charge of the Workhouse Infirmaries and Fever Hospitals, and whenever vacancies occur the Local Government Board urge upon the Guardians the desirability of offering such salaries as will induce qualified applicants to present themselves as candidates for the Office of Nurse.

SNEEM PIER (CO. KERRY.)

Mr. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is now more than four years since the Congested Districts Board took the preliminary steps towards erecting a much needed pier at Sneem, county Kerry, and that in consequence of this action on the part of the Board the barony and private individuals contributed about £300 to make the approaching road: whether he is also aware that the road has been completed for nearly two years and that the pier has not yet been commenced: and whether he will urge the Board to erect the pier as soon as possible?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The delay has been caused by a series of occurrences beyond the control of the Board, whose wish and intention are that the quay at Sneem shall be constructed with as little delay as possible.

Mr. DILLON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give any particulars of the occurrence?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said he was not in a position to do so.

PETTY SESSIONS FEES (CO. LIMERICK).

Captain DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Galway (Mr. D. Kilbride), I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Petty Sessions Clerk for Newcastle West, county Limerick, takes a fee of 2s. 6d. from each publican in the Petty Sessions district of Drumcollogher and Newcastle West for the magistrates' certificate which is issued at the annual licensing sessions; whether the clerk has shown the receipts of these fees in any accounts furnished by him to Dublin Castle, as required by the Statute 41 and 42 Vic., c. 69; and, what is the date of the last Return so made with the number and amount of fees received?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Publicans are required to supply, and to properly fill up the forms of certificate granted at the annual licensing Petty Sessions. This is not a duty imposed on the Clerk of Petty Sessions, and where, as in the present case, the clerk provides and completes these forms, it is customary, I understand, for publicans to pay a fee to the clerk. The matter is one of private arrangement between the parties, and no return is made, or required to be made to the Department of the Registrar of Petty Sessions clerks of sums so received by these officials.

GUN AND GAME LICENCES (IRELAND).

Captain DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is necessary that the names of persons holding a gun or game licence should be publicly posted at the post office in the district in which they reside?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: The Commissioners of Inland Revenue require their officers throughout the United Kingdom to send to the local postmasters lists to be exhibited at the post offices, shewing the names of the persons resident in each parish or township who have taken out game or gun licences.

POST OFFICE OVERTIME.

Mr. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the distribution of extra duty is confined solely to officers junior in the service, and on a low scale of wages; and, whether he will see that officers of experience, although on a higher scale, are also employed on overtime?

Mr. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is not aware of such an arrangement. The rule of the department is that extra duty should under ordinary circumstances be allotted according to its quality to officers of the rank to which such duty falls in the proper course of business.

CATTLE FOOD (IMPORTED).

MR. C. T. GILES (Cambridge, Wisbech): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that imported wheat flour is largely adulterated with maize flour, an inferior and cheaper article; and, whether he can take any steps to prevent purchasers being thus prejudiced?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I have no information as to the extent to which imported wheat flour is mixed with maize flour, as it is not a matter in which I have any jurisdiction. If there is an offence under the Sale of Food and Drug Acts, proceedings can be taken under those Acts, but I have no authority under which I can take any steps as suggested in the Question.

BRITISH ZUKON CHARTERED COMPANY.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is in a position to impart any information as to the character, constitution, and objects of the British Zukon Chartered Company, whose enabling Bill is now passing through the Canadian House of Commons; and, whether it is usual for a Bill creating a Chartered Company to be originated in any other body than the Imperial Parliament?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information on the subject. Colonial Legislatures frequently pass private Acts incorporating Companies.

FINANCE BILL.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he proposes to take the Committee on the Finance Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I hope to be able to make some further progress in Committee on this Bill on Thursday: but I do not expect to be able to give the hon. Member the opportunity which I promised him of moving the clause which he has placed on the Paper until after Whitsuntide.

CRIMEAN VETERAN (JOHN BRENNAN).

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the medical officers in Boyle have forwarded certificates that John Brennan, a Crimean veteran, formerly of the 41st Regiment, still bears the traces of the wounds received in the attack of Sebastopol; and whether in view of this man's very destitute condition, he will recommend that a grant, the same as last year, be made to him from the fund for the relief of Crimean veterans?

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS: No such certificates have been received nor was any award made to Brennan last year from Army funds.

FISHERY CRUISER (SCOTLAND).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he will state whether tenders for the new fishery cruiser for the Scottish Fishery Board were made on the specification dated 20th March 1897, or on an altered specification; if on an altered specification, will he explain the nature of the alterations, and what difficulties have arisen to cause so serious a delay in proceeding with the construction of this cruiser?

*THE LORD ADVOCATE: The Fishery Board are of opinion that it is not in the interests of the public service that negotiations not yet completed should be made public. No time has been unnecessarily occupied in these negotiations.

LLANGOLLEN SCHOOL BOARD.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (1) if he could state what was the nature of the Inspector's report who was sent in June 1896 to interview the Llangollen School Board as to the acquisition of land for a playground scheduled in an Act passed the previous year; and (2) whether the change which took place in the views of the Education Department between September 1896 and March 1897, as to the quantity of land required in the interests of educational efficiency, was brought about by any new evidence being submitted as to the requirements of the school in question?

Sir J. GORST: The Inspector reported that more playground was required, and advised that the Board should be pressed to acquire the whole of the land scheduled. The answer to second Question is in the negative.

FISHERY INQUIRY (LISTOWEL).

Captain DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Kerry (Mr. M. J. Flavin), I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland (1) if he can state when the fishery Inquiry was held in Listowel at which the close season was extended from 17th March to 1st May, and when did the byelaw so made come into effect and when does it expire; and (2) whether he is aware that at the recent prosecutions in Listowel the local licence agent swore that he issued licences to fish in March, and also requested the Fishery Board to send printed notices stating that the season would not open until 1st May, and that the notices so asked for were refused by the Fishery Board; (3) also that the prosecutor at Listowel Petty Sessions wrote a letter to the late Mr. Hewson, stating that the fishing season opened on 17th March; (4) if so, on what grounds are the licensed anglers on the River Feale prosecuted?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: The Inquiry referred to in the first paragraph was held on the 14th December 1892. The result of that inquiry was, a Close Season Order was made (not a byelaw), which came into operation six weeks after its publication —on the 20th January 1893,—and will remain in force until it is altered by a further Order, made in pursuance of the 5 and 6 Vic., cap. 106, sec. 33. I am not aware whether the local licensing agent, on the occasion of the recent prosecutions at Listowel, swore that he issued licences in March; but, whether he did or did not, I may point out that such a licence does not confer permission to fish during the close season, which extends from the 1st November to the 30th April. I cannot say whether application was made to the Fishery Board for notices stating that the season would not open until the 1st May, or whether the application was refused. No such application was made to or refused by the Inspectors of Fisheries. It is true that last year a letter was written to the effect stated at the conclusion of the Question, but that letter was written in error; and this year the fishermen were warned by the water bailiffs not to fish before the open season on the 1st May, or they would be prosecuted. The fishermen who persisted in fishing, notwithstanding this warning, have been prosecuted by the local Fishery Board, and the Executive have no power to interfere.

POWELL *v.* KEMPTON PARK COMPANY.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devon, Honiton): I beg to ask the Attorney General whether the betting case recently alluded to by him as likely to come before the courts is the case of Powell *v.* Kempton Park Company, which is set down for hearing; whether he is aware that the plaintiff and defendants are fellow shareholders in the company in question; and whether he will give instructions to have the case watched on behalf of the Crown?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When I made the observation to which the hon. Baronet refers I was not aware of the name of the case; I only knew that further proceedings were pending. I am not acquainted with the facts suggested as to the parties to the action. The Crown has no *locus standi*, but the hon. Baronet need not be afraid that any collusive Judgment will be obtained.

TITHE REDEMPTION (FEES).

Mr. ARTHUR JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any alteration has lately been made in regulating the fees or costs which fall upon tithe payers in cases of tithe redemption in England and Wales; how much these fees or costs amount to annually; and whether in future the Government will undertake to pay the costs incurred by tithe payers in carrying out cases of tithe redemption?

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No alteration has lately been made in regulating the fees or costs which fall upon tithe payers in cases of tithe redemption. The fees average £1,250 per annum, and amounted to £1,405 in the last complete year. It is not possible at present to give the precise figures of the costs. I understand that the Royal Commission on Agriculture has received much evidence on the question of Tithe Rent Charge, and I think it would be premature to deal with this point until their final Report has been received and considered.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Mr. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any and what arrangements have been or will be made upon the retirement of Mr. O'Dowd, C.B., to provide for the discharge of the duties of the offices of Judge Advocate General and Deputy Judge Advocate General?

Mr. MELLOR (York, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in case of a vacancy in the office of Judge Advocate General, the Government will appoint a Minister to discharge the duties of the office who is responsible to this House, and so put an end to the arrangement whereby they are discharged by the Judge of the Probate Court?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): A Question of the same kind has been placed on the Paper by my hon. Friend opposite. I have to state that Mr. O'Dowd has been continued in his office for two years more. Under the circumstances it would be premature to consider now how the office is to be dealt with after that.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND).

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the declared intention of the Government to introduce a Local Government Bill for Ireland next Session, and the consequent financial relief to landlords, the Government will proceed with the appointment of the proposed Commission to inquire into the fixing of rents by the Land Commission?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I do not think that the two subjects alluded to by the hon. Gentleman in this Question are germane the one to the other; or that the policy of the Government in connection with one would be modified by their policy in connection with the other.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I should like to ask, seeing the desire to relieve the irritation the landlords feel because their rents are reduced, whether, as they are getting money under the proposed Bill, the right hon. Gentleman thinks it necessary to hold a blunderbuss, in the shape of a Committee, in the face of the Land Commissioners? ["Order!"]

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND).

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state on what day before Whitsuntide he proposes to bring in the promised Bill dealing with the grant in aid of congested districts in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I understand that the Bill to which the hon. Gentleman refers is one that must be introduced in Committee of the House. If I am right in that supposition, it cannot be introduced before Whitsuntide. If so, I hope it will be introduced soon after. If, on the other hand, it could be introduced under the Standing Orders I should be very glad to bring it forward before Whitsuntide.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Mr. HOGAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Committee of Inquiry in connection with the British Museum is empowered to investigate the grievances of the attendants, and more particularly that they are the only class in the Museum who have not had an increase of salary since 1857?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: Yes, Sir. The powers of the Committee are amply sufficient to deal with the question to which the hon. Gentleman refers.

CRETE.

Mr. DILLON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention had been directed to the extraordinary character of the Cretan papers issued that day, in which the period—the most interesting period—from December 5 to February 24 was entirely skipped over without any Dispatches; and he wished to ask whether the Government proposed to issue further Papers filling up that period, or to leave the House entirely without information?

*Mr. CURZON: I think the Question asked by the hon. Member is a very reasonable one. But it suggests a possible misapprehension of the action of the Government in presenting these Papers, and I am, therefore, glad to have the opportunity of explaining that it is the intention of the Government to lay the Papers for the period referred to before the House. They are at present engaged in preparing a Blue-book with regard to Crete carrying the history of events, whether by telegrams or Dispatches, from the date of the last published Blue-book up to the present time. But that Blue-book is a large one, and will require some time to prepare; and pending its completion, in the desire to put the House in possession of information which I am sure everybody is anxious to have, they have presented in a Blue-book this morning the Reports of the Admiral and of Colonel Chermside.

Mr. DILLON: May I ask when we may expect the other Blue-book?

*Mr. CURZON: It is dangerous to make promises. We have no anxiety to keep back the book. Several persons at the Foreign Office are engaged daily in pressing it forward to as early a completion as possible.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Captain SINCLAIR (Forfar): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can now state on what dates he proposes to take further Scottish Estimates; and whether the Scottish Estimates or other Scottish Votes will be taken on or before Friday 2nd July?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: I do not think the present state of business is such that I can give an absolute pledge as to the allocation of the days of Supply; but I hope Scotch Supply will be taken soon after Whitsuntide.

Sir W. HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury state what will be the business on Friday?

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY: It is rather difficult to state what the business on Friday will be, because it will partly depend on the progress we make with the Bill under discussion tonight. I should hope that arrangements might be made at all events possibly for getting away after the morning sitting. But I must leave that question open for the moment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

WORKMEN (COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Considered in Committee [Progress, 27th May.]

[The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. J. W. Lowther, in the Chair.]

Clause 1,—

LIABILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO WORKMEN FOR INJURIES.

(1.) If in any employment to which this Act applies personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act.

(2.) Provided that:—

(*a*) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed:

(*b*) When it is decided, as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible nothing in this Act shall affect any liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and also under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act, except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

(3.) If any question arises as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies, or whether the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer, or of any person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, or whether the injury was caused by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment of the workman injured, or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, or otherwise as to the liability for compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement, shall, subject to the provisions of the first schedule to this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the second schedule to this Act.

(4.) If the Registrar of Friendly Societies certifies that any scheme of compensation or insurance for the workmen in any employment is on the whole not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of this Act, the employer may, until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of those workmen that the provisions of the scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act, and thereupon the employer shall be liable only in accordance with the scheme, but, save as aforesaid, this Act shall apply notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the commencement of this Act.

MR. ROBERT ASCROFT (Oldham) had given notice of his intention to move to add the following new sub-section to the clause:—

"(5) If any workmen or their representatives shall submit to the said Registrar *primâ facie* evidence that the provisions of any scheme are no longer so favourable to the workman as the provisions of this Act, or that the provisions of such scheme are being violated, or that the same is not being fairly administered by the employers, or that satisfactory reasons exist for cancelling the same, then he shall have power to appoint an inspector to examine into and report upon the complaint, and, if satisfied that good cause exists for such complaint, shall cancel the scheme.

"(6) Whenever a scheme has been certified as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the employer to answer all inquiries and to furnish all such accounts as may from time to time be required by the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and within seven days of the receipt of any complaint made by a workman or his representative against the scheme or the administration thereof the employer shall send copies of same to such Registrar."

The HON. MEMBER said that he had been in consultation with the Attorney General as to alterations of certain of its terms, and he now proposed it in the following form:—

(5.) "If any workmen or their representatives shall submit to the said Registrar *primâ facie* evidence that the provisions of any scheme are no longer so favourable to the workman as the provisions of this Act, or that the provisions of such scheme are being violated, or that the same is not being fairly administered by the employers, or that satisfactory reasons exist for revoking the certificate, then he shall have power to appoint an inspector to examine into and report upon the complaint, and, if satisfied that good cause exists for such complaint, shall revoke the certificate. Whenever a scheme has been certified as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the employer to answer all inquiries and to furnish all such accounts as may from time to time be required by the Registrar of Friendly Societies."

New sub-section as thus amended, agreed to; clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the clause.

Clause 2,—

APPLICATION OF ACT AND DEFINITIONS.

(1.) This Act shall apply only to employment on, in, or about a railway, factory, mine, quarry, or engineering work.

(2.) In this Act—

"Railway" means the railway of any railway company to which the Regulation of Railways Act 1871 applies, and "railway" and "railway company" have the same meaning as in that Act.

"Factory" has the same meaning as in the Factory and Workshop Acts 1878 to 1891, and also includes any dock, wharf, quay, or warehouse, to which any provision of the Factory Acts is applied by the Factory and Workshop Act 1895.

"Mine" means a mine to which the Coal Mines Regulation Act 1887, or the Metalliferous Mines Regulation Act 1872 applies.

"Quarry" means a quarry under the Quarries Act 1894.

"Engineering work" means any work of construction of a railroad, harbour, dock, canal, or sewer, and includes any building or other work on which machinery driven by steam, water, or other mechanical power is used for the purpose of the construction thereof.

"Employer" means any body of persons corporate or unincorporate.

"Workman" includes every person who is engaged in an employment to which this Act applies, whether by way of manual labour or otherwise, and whether his agreement is one of service or apprenticeship or otherwise, and is expressed or implied, is oral or in writing.

MR. CHARLES HARRISON (Plymouth had given notice of an Amendment to omit Sub-section (1) and to insert:

"This Act shall apply only to employment on, in, or about a railway, tramway, factory, mine, quarry, or engineering work, and any employment or work to which the expression 'workman' in the Employer and Workman's Act 1875 extends."

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS said the Amendment seemed to be an ingenious way of getting the word "tramway" in at an early stage of the clause. He thought the hon. Member had put it in the wrong place, and that it ought to come after the word "quarry." All the Amendments ought, in fact, to come after the word "quarry," as the Government, whose Bill it was, were entitled to have their proposals laid before the Committee before those of private Members.

Mr. J. M. MACLEAN (Cardiff) moved, in Sub-section (1), to leave out the word "mine." His object, he explained, in moving this Amendment, was to draw attention to the very serious consequences which the passing of this Bill would have if it was made applicable to the coal trade generally. He spoke on the authority of figures which had been supplied to him when he said that this Bill, if carried as it was now, and applied to the coal trades, would impose a special tax on the trade of Cardiff alone of about £150,000 a year. The Government had made several attempts to minimise the amount of the burden which would be cast upon the trade by their Bill, but, so far as he had seen, they had not been able to bring forward any exact figures showing how their calculations were made up. In fact, their statements amounted to nothing more than the expression of a pious hope that the Bill would not bear so hardly upon the coal trade as the coalowners themselves seemed to imagine. Of what good was a statement of that kind to contradict exact calculations, made by men who were conversant with the trade generally, and who knew exactly how the Bill would bear upon them? There was a letter in *The Times* of that day from Sir William Thomas Lewis, who certainly knew what he was talking about, and who pointed out that, whereas now the burden of providing compensation for accidents was only 1d. per ton, of which ¾d. was borne by the workman, in future the whole burden would be transferred to the employer, and would be raised to 3d. per ton. This was a very remarkable transference for the Government to attempt to make, and he should like to know upon what principle they proposed to single out the coal trade for this burden? He imagined that they were not acting upon any principle whatever, because the Home Secretary had already been told that there was no logic in this Bill, and no justice, but that it was a Bill which rested upon expediency. The principles of political economy had been long ago flung to the winds, and now it was said the Government were justified in laying a tax upon a particular trade, and transferring a large portion of property from one class to another in this trade without being actuated by any considerations of justice whatever—considerations of expediency being apparently all that they cared about. He did not know whether these were considerations of political expediency, or any other kind of expediency, but he would tell the Government that in the long run what was right and just would be found to be also expedient, and the Government, in doing an injustice because it was expedient, would bring calamitous results upon themselves. This was a matter which seriously affected the coal trade, and especially in that part of the country where he had the honour of representing a great coal shipping port. He knew it was of no use to press this Amendment to exclude mines from the Bill. The Government had chosen their course of action, and would, no doubt, persevere with it. But he protested against what he believed to be an injustice upon one particular trade, and this without adequate consideration of the burden which the Government were imposing. It was quite clear the whole course of legislation proposed by this Bill must ultimately be reviewed at much greater length than had been possible lately. The principles must be thoroughly discussed, and although this Amendment might not be pressed now, the Government would in a short time find it necessary to extend this Bill so as to take in the general industries of the country, and not levy a special tax upon a few specially selected industries. He begged to move the Amendment.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir Matthew White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) could quite understand the object of his hon. Friend in calling attention to the special way in which the mining industry of the country was affected by the Bill, but he protested against the hon. Gentleman's assumption that the Government, in framing the Measure, had had no regard to justice, but merely to expediency. He was perfectly prepared to defend the Bill upon the ground of its justice. ["Hear, hear!"] So far from being unjust or unsound in principle, the only industry in the country which was raising much protest against this legislation was the coal industry, and especially that of South Wales.

MR. REGINALD McKENNA (Monmouth, N.): No, no! South Wales has no objection to it.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that, at all events, he was perfectly well aware that there was a feeling on the part of the coalowners of the country that the Bill did put upon them a more serious burden than was put upon other industries, and he was perfectly ready to express more than a pious hope that they were quite mistaken in the view they had taken of the matter. While admitting that there was a considerable burden laid upon all employers by the Bill, still, he said, it was not an unfair burden, and it was a burden with a limit much different from that which was suggested by Sir William Thomas Lewis in his letter to *The Times*, or by the actuary whom that gentleman had consulted. In introducing the Bill he mentioned that he had calculated the cost of carrying out the Measure as it stood, with all its provisions, in the coal trade in two different ways—namely, from the German experience, allowing for all the differences, and from the actual facts as known from the records of accidents that had occurred in Great Britain, and on the estimates formed from figures derived from the excellent permanent relief societies such as the Lancashire and Cheshire. Applying this calculation over the whole districts, and not in any particular mine, he found that the percentage of compensation paid would amount to little more than 1 per cent. of the wages. He had since applied the calculation to the district of his hon. Friend, and, taking the year 1894—when the frightful Albion accident occurred, which caused a loss of 290 lives—and 1895, which was an ordinary year, he found that on the same basis the proportion of compensation paid under this Bill would not exceed 1 per cent. of the wages paid. He was borne out in that calculation by certain testimony he had received from South Wales itself, but which he was not at liberty at present to quote. He did not desire to minimise the importance of the Bill as regarded the coal trade of this country. He was quite conscious that many interested in that trade believed the Bill laid upon them a heavier burden than upon other trades. All he could say was that the Government had not proposed this Bill without calculating what they thought would be the burden, and without regard to the present liability of the coal owners, what was done in the countries they competed with and the necessities of the situation. The Government had not done what was unfair, unjust, or merely politically expedient in the case of the coalowners. The Government believed that the Bill would not have the effect on the coal trade that the hon. Member for Cardiff and others associated with him contemplated, and that the burden, if one considered all the present liabilities, moral, customary, and legal, would certainly not mean more than a difference of between 5s. and 15s. in the pound. When the Government contemplated such a big object as they had in this Bill they did not think they were asking the House to accept too much, and he believed this Bill would be accepted by the House and the country as imposing no unjust burdens and conferring great advantages. [*Cheers.*]

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said those who, like himself, were interested in the working of coal mines, for the moment felt grateful to his hon. Friend (Mr. Maclean), but he was afraid his Amendment came rather late in the day. The House had passed the principle of the Bill, and the question now seemed to be more what industries could be brought into the Bill than what industries could be taken out. At the same time, he wished to reserve to himself, and he believed many others in the House wished to do the same, the position they would take towards the Bill if those other industries were not included. If the principle of this Bill was correct—a doctrine he did not admit, because he believed it a retrograde manner of dealing with workmen and employer—he should be prepared when they came to the Third Reading to give his reasons for thinking that the Bill was unfair, because it had been unfairly carried out, even according to the principle professed in the Bill. He thanked the Home Secretary for the way in which he had spoken of the coal industry, but he did not look upon the right hon. Gentleman's calculations as any more valuable than his own. It was very difficult indeed in the very short time they had had, by the way in which the Bill had been hurried on step by step, to know where they were, or to know where the incidence of the Bill would be. He was anxious that if they proceeded with the Bill they should have a little more time to discuss these very important matters which were on the Paper that day, and which would come in the course of the consideration of the schedules, because, after all, they came back in a great Bill like this to that which had been well said—whatever was best administered was best. If the detail of the working of the Bill was considered in Committee, because it had not been worked out in the Bill itself, he believed that those industries which ought to have been in and those which were already in the Bill, would feel the benefit of that additional attention. They had to look to the different positions which coal owners occupied in considering this question. In Northumberland, about 90 per cent. of the coal was in direct competition with foreign coal; in the district he represented they had a smaller proportion of such competition, while the east side of Durham had rather more than one half of its coal dependent upon foreign export. On the other hand, many of the Yorkshire and Welsh collieries had a home market at their back, and their position was very different to that of those dependent on foreign competition. He did not believe his hon. Friend the Member for Cardiff would be able to proceed with his Amendment, because they had to look to the industries which should be included in the Bill rather than to those which should be left out.

MR. HENRY SETON-KARR (St. Helens) said he could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cardiff. If the benefits of the Bill were to be extended, the miners should be included in its scope. The House should appreciate the burden the Bill would impose on the mining industry before it passed this Bill, particularly when they remembered that it was allied to so many others. If the burden became too great, how would they shift it? Sooner or later some of the burden would have to be thrown on the State. The Home Secretary had kindly shown him privately the way in which he arrived at his calculations, and he was perfectly convinced that the right hon. Gentleman had gone very carefully into the matter. But Mr. Neison and other eminent actuarial authorities said the Government figures were not accurate. The latter put the cost of the Bill to the coal mining industry at 1 per cent. on the wages, while Mr. Neison and others said it would vary from 2½ to 4¼ per cent. Where high authorities differed so largely, great care should be taken to ascertain the extent of the burden proposed to be placed on one of the most important industries of this country. The trades unions, for the last seven years, had been trying to raise the price of coal. Arbitration and a great strike had been tried. Nothing that could have been adopted had not been tried. But the price of coal and also wages had gone down. Would this Bill produce better results than the efforts of the trades unions? Many were voting for the Bill on the assumption that the consumer would pay the cost of the Bill. Under present conditions, he could not pay, and if the shoulders on which they put the burden could not bear it, disaster to the working classes of this country might result. He was in favour of universal compensation, but he would not undertake the responsibility of convincing a Lancashire collier of the benefits of the Bill when he found himself walking the streets because his colliery was closed owing to foreign competition. The financial aspects of the Bill were so important and involved such large considerations, that time should be given to ascertain the exact nature of the burden to be imposed on one of our most important industries, and nothing should be done to rush the Bill through the House.

*MR. EMERSON BAINBRIDGE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) said he would not support the Amendment, but he was indebted to the hon. Member for Cardiff for having elicited from the Home Secretary that he still adhered to the statement that the cost of the Bill would be 1 per cent. on the wages in the coal mines. But there was a marked difference between that view and the view taken by the coal owners. If the Home Secretary considered that

1 per cent. indicated the amount of extra cost which it was just that the mineowner should bear, what would be his view if on further investigation the 1 per cent. was increased to 4 per cent., which was much nearer the mark? If the coal trade came forward and said they would accept the Home Secretary's figure, and would agree to a tax equivalent to 1 per cent., would the Government in that case undertake that the State should pay the rest? He thought that a charge of 1 per cent. was quite enough for the mineowner to bear. He was able to say from an extensive experience of coal-mining that the actual average profits on coal were now not more than 3d. per ton, and in a large number of cases, especially in Lancashire, 1½d. per ton would be nearer the mark. It was very important to make the burdens imposed by this Bill as slight as possible. The Government must have been struck with the contemptuous satisfaction with which the Bill had been received by the labour section of the House, and he hoped they would have ample time to discuss at length some of the chief burdens imposed by the Bill.

Mr. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) thought that to strike out mines from the Bill would not be in the interests of those who worked in collieries. All his sympathies were with the miners, and it was through the colliery interest that he had the honour to sit in that House. He thought it was a pity that there should be exceptional treatment for certain trades. They must hope that in the future other such Bills might be introduced in order that all trades might get the same advantages. If the Bill passed in its present form it would be extremely difficult for mine owners to make arrangements with the insurance companies for insurance, and if other trades were also included, they would be able to spread the risk, and bring down the terms of insurance. A representative of the miners in his own district had told him the other day that what the masters had got to do was to put on 2d. a ton. But who was going to pay that? He very much doubted if the masters would be able to charge it. A representative of the glass trade with whom he had spoken was in great anxiety because he imagined he would have to pay this extra 2d. a ton for the coal which was required in his trade. That particular trade, in consequence of constant hampering by legislation, was being driven out of the country, and this man of whom he spoke had been obliged to erect glass works abroad and to import his own glass into England. He cited the case of an explosion which occurred in 1895, with which the name of his family was associated. The colliery was supposed to be absolutely free from gas, but there happened to be a sort of underground lake of gas, which was tapped, and nearly 200 men lost their lives. If this Bill had at that time been law it would have meant a payment of £60,000 in hard cash, and £30,000 or £40,000 for putting the mine in order. It was easy to understand that in such a case as that an employer might be ruined, and that would not be to the interest of the men whom he employed. If all trades had been brought into the Bill it would not be so objectionable, but they must make the best of a bad job. They could not do that, however, by supporting the Amendment.

Mr T. W. LEGH (Lancashire, Newton) said he did not see his way to vote for the Amendment. He pointed out, however, that there had been a serious conflict of opinion as to the exact cost which would be imposed on the coal industry, and the comforting expressions which had fallen from the Home Secretary had been somewhat vague in character. He thought some more definite statement should be made, and he appealed to his right hon. Friend to produce his figures. There was no need for desperate hurry in finishing the Committee stage of this Bill, and they might even adjourn over the holidays for the purpose. If the figures were produced before the Committee stage was concluded it would enable the public to judge between the two parties.

Captain BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) said that in regard to this Bill, which introduced an almost novel principle into our legislation, statistics were the only means which men in his own position could have to enable them to form an opinion. So far as he could gather there was no very strong objection taken to the Bill by the employers except by those engaged in mining. Although he was inclined to think that the principle embodied in the Bill was a sound one, if there had been serious objections taken by those mainly interested, he would not have been willing to force the adoption of the principle upon them until the question had for some considerable time been before the country.

*MR. J. W. LOGAN (Leicestershire, Harborough) said he recognised the difficulty there was in discussing this question without any figures before them, but still they did know that every year 1,000 miners lost their lives while pursuing their employment. If the families of each of those men received the maximum amount of compensation allowed by the Bill, the total amount of liability cast upon the coal trade would be £300,000. If they estimated that for permanent or temporary disablement another £300,000 was cast upon the coal owners, he thought they would be well within the mark. Personally he did not think the total liability would reach £600,000 per annum. He thought the estimate of ½d. per ton which was made by the Colonial Secretary was more likely to represent the liability than the 2d. per ton which was the estimate of the coal owners. But the more he found hon. Gentlemen like the hon. Member for Cardiff pleading for the exclusion of miners from the Bill, the more convinced he was that he ought to vote in favour of including miners. If it was right that this enormous sum of money should be paid in compensation for the death or injury of those engaged in the mining industry, it was high time that some Bill of this sort were passed.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) pointed out that the German system had not been followed in respect to the payment for small injuries. That would have an immense effect financially upon the Bill. In his opinion that was the greatest blot on the Bill, because the workman was no longer able to be a party to his own insurance.

MR. CHARLES SEELY (Lincoln) rose, as a colliery owner, to oppose the Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"] He had always thought it was not very reasonable or just that a workman should suffer, and that the employer should suffer nothing whatever, and therefore he was glad this Bill had been introduced in order to amend that state of things. ["Hear, hear!"] It was proper, too, that the provisions of the Bill should be extended to mines. At the same time he would like the Government to realise that there was a difference of opinion between them and the colliery owners as to the burden laid on the trade. It was much more likely that the coal owners who had personal knowledge of all the accidents—and there were many resulting in sprained ankles and sprained backs and the like which were not serious enough to be returned to the Government inspector—were better judges of the amount of the burden which would be laid on the trade than those who had brought in the Bill. There was no doubt that the burden to be met by those who had to sell coal in competition with foreign countries would be very heavy, and the Government would act wisely if they considered whether anything could be done to lighten it. It must be borne in mind that an employer who had taken every precaution at very great expense to insure the safety of his workmen might have a burden of £60,000, £70,000, £100,000 or even £200,000 or £300,000 suddenly thrown upon his shoulders. He hoped he would not be considered as speaking in any way hostilely to the Bill. He most cordially supported the Measure and was most grateful to the Government for having introduced it.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.) said he was sure the Committee would recognise the very liberal spirit in which his hon. Friend had dealt with the Bill. The Government made no complaint of the criticisms made by the coal owners, indeed they sympathised with the fears expressed. They still maintained that on the average the cost to the coal owners would certainly not be likely to exceed ¾d. per ton, though it had been put on behalf of the coal owners, as high as 2d. and even 3d. per ton. Some hon. Gentlemen suggested that they should delay the progress of the Bill in order that they might contrast the two sets of figures. He really did not see that any practical advantage would be gained. ["Hear, hear!"] It had been well said that statistics could prove anything, and without wishing to impugn the good faith of those who had put what he thought an extravagant estimate before the House he could not believe that under the present system they could arrive at any agreement upon the figures. Of course there was a great deal in the Bill which was uncertain and which was open to either side to interpret as they pleased. For instance, they dealt with the question of the lengthened period of incapacity during which payment might be made. No doubt that allowed an opening for a great variety of opinion. The mine owners, on the one hand, accepted in almost all these cases what he might call the maximum average, while the Government's maximum might be too low. The main thing he would press upon the Committee was that they did not think the charge, whatever it was, whether it was ¾d. or 3d. per ton, would really in the long run fall, at all events as regarded the major portion of it, upon the employer personally. They were dealing with all accidents, and not accidents by negligence. They did not want to treat this as a punitive Bill or to impose everything on the employers. On the contrary, they desired to see the charge imposed by the Bill spread over the trade, and in that way they thought it would not be an amount which would in any way interfere with the prosperity of the trade. His hon. Friend said a charge of this kind would place a trade at a disadvantage with foreign countries. He thought that the hon. Member forgot that the charge at present under the law in foreign countries was larger than the average stated by the mine owners themselves as the probable cost of this Bill. For instance, in Germany the cost upon the mine owners was something like 2 per cent., while in the opinion of the Government the cost under this Bill would not be much above 1 per cent. Another hon. Gentleman attached importance to the fact that under the German system the first 13 weeks were excluded from the accident fund. That was quite true, but the men were put upon the provident fund, but that included a great number of things with which the Government did not deal at all, and to the provident fund, which included sickness, superannuation, and other matters, the employer was compelled to contribute 25 per cent., in addition to paying the whole of the cost of the accident fund, and accordingly if the two were put together it would be found that the incidence of German taxation was even higher than anything stated, except, perhaps, the most excessive estimate of all, in regard to Britsh trade. Reference had been made to the question of uncertainty. In regard to that, the Government were fully alive to the difficulty, and were anxious to make the liability as definite as possible, because it was only by making it definite that insurance could be properly arranged to meet it. The Government would endeavour to meet the views of those who represented both the employers and the workmen in the desire that some greater definiteness should be given to this clause, and when that was done he believed a great deal of the objection would be removed.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Stafford, Lichfield) thought that if the Amendment were passed most of the supporters of the Bill would cease to take any interest in it, for to take mines out of the Bill would be to make the Measure a sham. And when it was said that the mine-owners would be ruined, he reminded the Committee that they said the same thing when the Mines Regulations Act was passed, and they were not ruined yet.

Mr. FRANCIS NEWDIGATE (Warwickshire, Nuneaton), although a mine-owner, had not sufficient knowledge of himself to be able to form an opinion what the taxation on this particular industry would be. But if there was one class who ought to be protected by any Workmen's Compensation Bill, it was the miners. That being so, he should be very sorry indeed if the Amendment were carried, and he should most decidedly vote against it.

Mr. MACLEAN explained that his Amendment was put down before the general discussion on the principle of the Bill, and if he had persevered in moving the Amendment it was only for the purpose of drawing some definite statement from the Government as to what they understood to be the bearing of the Bill. He did not know that they had got any definite statement yet. However, he was obliged to the Home Secretary for the spirit in which he had met the Amendment. Would his right hon. Friend produce the figures he had cited, and have them placed before the country, because the country had not yet been afforded the means to understand the bearing of the Bill? He should be satisfied with the result of the discussion if the Government would promise that their figures should be placed before the country before the Report stage. He begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. EDWARD GOULDING (Wilts, Devizes) moved, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "agriculture," the object being to extend the Bill to agriculture. He submitted that it was impossible for an agricultural labourer, with the wage he earned, to insure against accidents; while, with reference to the objection that agriculture was not a dangerous trade, and the risks few, he urged that, with the growing use of machinery, those risks must increase, while even now the number of accidents was considerable. In his own Division no less than 21 accidents of a serious kind had taken place during the last two years. They included accidents from steam ploughs, threshing machines, chaff-cutting machines, carting and loading, and also two cases of blood-poisoning resulting from shearing. He found that only two of those people—and he had made careful inquiry—had got any compensation whatever; they got the small compensation of 2s. 6d. a week from their individual employer. If that sum had been spent in insuring against accidents, it would have given each of the men an adequate sum in case of accident. There were some localities where there were rich residents, but that class was decreasing all over the country. The Death Duties had relieved that class of a great deal of their surplus cash. They could not be expected to contribute to funds raised in relief of those people as they had done in the past. Among other objections, it was said that if this Amendment were introduced, old men would be driven out of employment, but that could not possibly be the case, because the insurance companies informed him that it would not pay them to send down their inspectors to inquire into the details of such cases. Taking a farm of 1,000 acres, and a man paying £1,000 in wages per annum, the whole liability placed upon his shoulders by making him insure would be a sum of £3 or £4 a year. He suggested that the Government might include agriculture in this clause, and then, in the definition clause, limit the word to farms over 200 acres, on which machinery worked by steam was used. He recognised the statesmanlike courage of the Government in bringing forward this Measure, and he had no wish to embarrass them; but representing, as he did, an agricultural constituency, composed almost entirely of working men, he felt that he should not be doing his duty if he did not do his best to secure the inclusion of agricultural labourers in the Bill. [*Opposition cheers.*]

*MR. LOGAN said he hoped the Government would accept the Amendment, which was in the interests of the worst paid and most deserving class of the community. He personally would like to see all the toilers brought within the scope of the Bill, but as the Government could not see their way to do that, he implored them to include the most pathetic figure in our whole social system, condemned by apparently inexorable conditions to a life of unremitting toil, with the prospect of the poor-house as its only and probable termination. Of this he was positive—that this mighty Government was impotent to refuse the claims of the agricultural labourer if the representatives of agriculture in that House would be faithful to the trust which had been reposed in them. ["Hear, hear!"] As representing a large number of agricultural labourers, he implored those who had been returned to the House by the vote of agricultural labourers to be true to themselves, true to their constituents, and refuse to betray the men who sent them there. ["Hear, hear!"] The agricultural labourer was the last man in England who ought to be excluded from the provisions of the Bill, for, with the exception of those unfortunate outcasts of our industrial system who were compelled to work in sweated industries, the agricultural labourer was the worst paid white man in the world. ["Hear, hear!"] The nine or ten shillings a week which were paid to him in some counties was a disgraceful remuneration to be paid to any man in a Christian country. ["Hear, hear!"] But even the 14 or 15 shillings a week which might be taken on the average throughout England was, in his judgment, a miserable pittance to be paid to any able-bodied man, and more especially to the men who had to labour faithfully upon the spot where their forefathers for succeeding generations had laboured before them, and to whose patient toil and homely skill they were indebted for the most fertile fields in the world. He need not labour the case, for it was well known that the wages of the agricultural labourer did not permit of his putting anything by, and when sickness or accident overtook him he was a miserable dependant upon the charity of others. ["Hear, hear!"] He appealed to all men in the House who secured the vote of the agricultural labourer at the last General Election by promising, either directly or indirectly, to better the lot of the unfortunate men —he appealed to all Members who fought under the title of the toiler's true friend to assist him in bringing before the Government this claim of the labourers to compensation when maimed by doing their duty. In his judgment it was not a farmer's question, but a landowner's question, for the farmer, after all, was only the landowner's bailiff, working at piecework. He also appealed to the owners of agricultural land. He would, if they liked, grant that they were badly off as compared with 1879-80, when rents were at their highest, but would ask them to remember that their land to-day was worth in the market at least 600 millions sterling more than at the commencement of the century, and the plea of poverty would not exonerate them from doing their duty by the men who had given their possessions that additional value. As a rough calculation he assumed that the inclusion of agricultural labourers would not cost one penny per acre per year for insurance against liability. One penny per acre on the 48 million acres of cultivated area would produce £200,000, or ten shillings per year on each £100 paid in wages, the annual wage bill being estimated at forty millions sterling. Thus, on a farm of 400 acres, the approximate cost of insuring compensation to all the men employed would be £1. 13s. 4d. per year, and if that proved too great a burden the Government might provide that the farmer should deduct the cost as he did the tax under Schedule A from the rent. But, on whomsoever the cost might fall, he was there to claim as a right compensation for the agricultural labourer, for he could not imagine that any attempt would be made to deduct the paltry amount from the wages of the labourers. The first charge upon the land was the maintenance of the people reared and cradled on its bosom, and if that were true, as it certainly was, when the men were in health, the claim was doubly great when they were incapacitated by accident from earning their daily bread. He appealed to the Colonial Secretary, who in days gone by had so eloquently represented the case of the agricultural labourer. ["Hear, hear!"] He appealed to the Government to add to the popularity which they would win by the introduction of this Bill by including within its provsions the most pathetic figure in their social system. He would tell them how to win Petersfield. [*Laughter.*] Let them include the agricultural labourer within the scope of the Bill. He appealed to the elected representatives of the agricultural labourer to do their duty by the men who sent them there, remembering that what they thought or knew or believed in the end was of little consequence as compared with the consequence of what they did. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that there were many Members who would naturally feel great sympathy with the Amendment. But in introducing the Bill he had explained the reasons why the Government did not see their way clear to include in it agricultural labourers; and he was bound to say that, if the agricultural labourers were introduced into the Bill now, it would be practically making the Bill inclusive of all labour in the country. [*Opposition cheers.*] He would not say that what was good for one class of labour was not good for another; but he submitted, as a practical argument, that in introducing a new principle like that of the Bill it was necessary to proceed in the first instance on the safest and soundest ground, and to leave further extensions of the principle to be made in the future. The Government hoped and believed that the time was not far distant when they would be able to apply the principles which underlay the Bill to all the industries of the country—[*Opposition cheers*]—as was the case in other countries. But what they said now was that if they were to seek to give to those principles a general application at the present time they would overload the Bill before the House. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] That, at least, was the opinion of the country; and he thought that unless there was a very strong assurance from Members representing the agricultural interest, that the farmers of the country were willing to accept the principle of the Amendment any Government would shrink from making such a proposal. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not want to quote the case of Germany too much; but it was four or five years after the initiation of legislation of this character in Germany that the agricultural labourer was included in it. His position was this, that to apply the principle to the very small farmers of the country, who were themselves very little different from the labourers they employed, would be to frighten them—would be to deal unjustly with them; and, besides, they were not men who were most ready to insure themselves. ["Hear, hear!"] It had been said that the cost of insuring agricultural labour from the small risk involved would be trifling. He granted that. He thought it would not be even a half-crown. But he asked those who had any experience of the agricultural interest, who knew, not the large farmers represented by his hon. Friend the Mover of the Amendment, but the small men who farmed 50 or 60 acres by means of family labour, with the occasional assistance of a "hind"—as the agricultural labourer was called in his part of the country—whether they could induce farmers of that class generally to insure the casual labourer whom they employed on their farms? ["Hear, hear!"] The Government had admitted within the scope of the Bill all dangerous trades and industries. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] Agriculture was not a dangerous trade or industry. With the exception of shipping, the Government had certainly introduced all dangerous trades about which they had specific information in regard to accidents. They had no such information in regard to agriculture. ["Hear, hear!"] His hon. Friend who moved the Amendment spoke about limiting the principle to farms of over 200 acres. But he thought his hon. Friend would find a difficulty in working out that suggestion logically. What about the difference between a farm of 200 acres in the moorlands of Scotland and a farm of 200 acres in the neighbourhood of London? His hon. Friend also spoke about drawing a distinction in favour of agricultural labourers who might be employed in charge of steam machinery. That, again, would introduce a principle very difficult of application. Those who were familiar with the agricultural industry would know how often it happened that intermediary and casual labour was employed in charge of machinery; how often a travelling threshing machine, the property of a small farmer, went the round of the various districts for the purposes of threshing after the harvest, and how casual labour was frequently used in looking after those machines. ["Hear, hear!"] They should not go beyond that which appeared to be practical. Let them confine themselves within the limits of the Bill as it stood. Even hon. Members who sympathised with the agricultural labourers must see that it would be dangerous to overload the Bill—that it would be far safer to be content with the present experiment, with a view to seeing later on how far it might be possible to extend the principles of the Bill to other industries. ["Hear, hear!"]

*MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that, as the representative of a division half of whose electors consisted of agricultural labourers, he joined in the appeal that had been addressed to the Government, especially as there must be sitting on the Benches opposite many hon. Gentlemen who had pledged themselves at the last General Election to do something for the social improvement of the labourer on the land. If this were a just proposal for the protection of the agricultural labourer, it ought to be included in the Bill; and it was no answer whatever to it to say that it would overweight the Bill. Was it just to the agricultural labourer to say that because he was not represented by a powerful trades union organisation, and therefore was not able to present his case with that authority and solidarity which such organisations commanded, he was to be excluded from the benefits of the Bill? There were, he regretted to say, a large number of women employed in agriculture, and it was necessary that women in the agricultural industry should be protected as well as women in the textile industries. He would present to the Committee a few instances of the injustice which would be done by the rejection of this Amendment.

There were a number of small towns in agricultural districts with paper mills, cloth mills, and various other small factories. A man is injured in the course of his work in one of those factories, and under the provisions of the Bill he comes to his employer for compensation. An agricultural labourer is also injured in the course of his employment in the same village; but instead of coming upon his employer he comes upon the rates. The result was that the manufacturers who owned the mill had not only to pay under the Bill for the man injured in the mill, but he had also to pay, through the poor rate, for the labourer injured upon the farm. That manifestly was a great injustice. Then take the case of a railway company. There were many parishes in which 60, 70, or 80 per cent. of the rates fell upon the railway passing through the parish. If a man in the employment of the Company was injured he had to be compensated by the railway company. If an agricultural labourer was injured the railway company had also to pay for him through the rates. It was the same with manufacturers in such towns as Lincoln. They would have to pay compensation not only for their own accidents, but compensation also for accidents to injured agricultural labourers and to other workers outside the scope of this Bill. He trusted that even at this last moment the Government would accept this very reasonable extension of the Bill, and would not refuse to do an act of justice to a very large section of the industrial community of this country.

Mr. ARTHUR JEFFREYS (Hants, Basingstoke) said it was a matter of very grave doubt to him whether the granting of compensation under this Bill to the agricultural labourer would tend to improve his condition in life. If he were perfectly certain it would, he would have the greatest pleasure in voting for the Amendment. But he believed that, in the end, it would be found that it would cause the labourer to lose his employment under small employers. There was no compensation paid under the present law to agricultural labourers who were injured, but his experience of the country was that, when a labourer did meet with an accident, the landowners invariably made a subscription for him, and he got quite as much money in that way as he would by compensation. [*Opposition cries of* "No!"] Well, he could only speak of the county in which he lived, and he knew that what he had just stated was the fact. If compensation was to be paid, then, to begin with, they ought to have some fund from which to draw the compensation money. If they proposed to have a State fund from which they could draw the compensation money, well and good; but from whom would this compensation come now? The labourers in the country looked forward to some day having a small holding of their own. When they became small holders they employed labour—perhaps one or two men. How could they afford to employ labour if they had such a liability as this Bill would place upon them hanging over their heads? The small holder was, after all, very little removed from the agricultural labourer. If he met with an accident he would receive no compensation whatever, whereas if the man whom he employed, and who was as well off as the small holder himself, met with an accident, he would receive under the Bill a compensation which would be quite sufficient to ruin his employer. It was asked, why should they not insure? He would reply that the small employer of labour—the man who employed one or two labourers—would have great difficulty in insuring on the same terms as the man who employed 50 or 60 men. As a matter of fact, the small farmer did not insure his ricks and other property now, and the same thing would happen if this Amendment were carried. Then, when an accident happened, and this liability fell upon him, he would be reduced to absolute ruin. He would like to point out, too, that one effect of the Amendment would be that no farmers would employ old and decrepit labourers. They would be in exactly the same category under the Bill as the strong labourers, and as they were more liable to meet with accidents than the younger and stronger men, no farmer would care to run the risk of increasing his liability by employing them. The result would be that these old men, who were still able to earn a little money during the long harvesting days, would be deprived of their employment. His hon. Friend had also alluded to the extension of the Bill to steam machinery. The Home Secretary, he thought, had given a sufficient reply to that point, and had shown how difficult it would be to limit the liability to the one or two men who were in charge of the engines. Everyone acquainted with farming operations knew that, in addition to the men in charge of the engines, there were half-a-dozen other men engaged either on the rick or in taking away the corn from the engine. Those men were brought in for the day, and were paid by the day, but if this Amendment were carried, he took it that in case of an accident they would receive the same compensation as the men in charge of the engine. His opinion on the whole subject was that if the Amendment were carried, it would do more harm than good to the agricultural labourer.

Mr. ROBINSON SOUTTAR (Dumfriesshire) said he had also a similar Amendment on the Paper, but after the very strong way in which the Home Secretary had put his foot down, it was not, perhaps, wise that he should spend more than a minute in discussing the question, but he should like to spend that minute in grumbling on behalf of his constituents. He represented farm labourers, and he was not at all afraid, as the previous speaker had prophesied, that his constituents would find themselves without employment if the farmers were included in this Measure. He should like to thank the Government for what they had included in the Bill. He had miners and quarriers in his constituency, and he was thankful that they were included, but he should have been glad if he could have gone down to his constituency and told the farm servants what the Government had done for them. As far as he could make out, the only objection to the inclusion of farm servants was the fear that it might, perhaps, ruin small farmers. He had plenty of small farmers in his constituency, and he should be very sorry to ruin any of them, but he did not believe for a single moment that they would be ruined any more than the small builders would be ruined by this Measure. He believed that in the end the landlord would have to pay the money. As to the number of accidents, it was said that they would be small, but although the gross percentage might be a small one it would not be a great consolation to a man who was injured to be told that he was one of a small number. The smaller the number the more easy it would be to include agriculture. Another point which might be urged was that the farmer's labourer was so poorly paid in Scotland and England that it was impossible to lay by for a rainy day. He was exceedingly glad to hear what the Home Secretary said with regard to the future, that he hoped the time would come, and come perhaps in the life of the present Government, when the farm labourers would be included. He did trust that the time of their exclusion would be exceedingly brief.

Major RASCH (Essex, S.E.) said they who represented agricultural labourers and were their champions, were bound to stand up for them. From his own experience, he did not think it would be to the interest of the agricultural labourer to include him in this Bill. [*A laugh from the Opposition.*] He thought he could explain to hon. Gentlemen opposite why not, and if an Amendment was put down as to machinery he should vote for it; but that was a totally different thing. It would be totally inapplicable to the farmers and labourers in the east of England, whom he represented. It was all very well for a farmer of 1,000 acres to become liable under this Bill, but those were not the men with whom he had to deal. How could they make a farmer of 150 acres, who sometimes could not make both ends meet, liable to the extent of £150? He ventured to say if such men were brought under the purview of this Bill the labourers would not be employed by the small farmer. For eleven years, since he entered that House, he had advocated the cause of the labourer, but he could assure the Committee that it was simply and solely from his own personal experience that he declared that if they brought the agricultural labourer under the Bill, it would deprive him of work. He could not, he regretted to say, vote for the Amendment.

Mr. H. H. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): I have already expressed an opinion that the more logical course would have been to include all the trades of the country. [" Hear, hear!"] That, however, has been decided in the contrary sense, and we are therefore driven, by Amendments on this clause, to consider the special claims of particular trades now excluded. I have listened to this discussion, and I observe a marked divergence as between the opinion of Her Majesty's Government and the opinion of the Members who sit behind them as to the ground on which this Amendment is to be resisted. ["Hear, hear!"] On one side the justice of the claim of the men who may have been injured, to be admitted, was acknowledged, but then we are told we must proceed by steps; they must proceed in a tentative fashion, and then the right hon. Gentleman held out the hope that the agricultural labourers may be at last admitted. But the hon. Members for Aldershot and Essex hold a totally different opinion. They in the interest of the agricultural labourer deprecate his inclusion. More extraordinary reasons than they have given I never heard. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member for Aldershot says that the labourer would get less money under this Bill than he gets at present. The landowners and farmers are so liberal and philanthropic that they give the labourer a larger sum than anything he could expect under this Bill. A great many of the large employers of labour throughout the country might say the same, they are so beneficent as employers; but as I understand, the object of this Bill is that the labourer shall not be dependent on eleemosynary assistance given of charity, but that he should have it as a right to which each self-respecting citizen is entitled from the law without sending the hat round. [*Cheers.*] Then we are told that if the labourer is included in this Bill he will cease to be employed. [*A laugh.*] Who then would till the soil? I believe that is an illusory apprehension. In what different position is the farmer from the small employers of labour in the towns? ["Hear, hear!"] I believe nearly half the factories are places in which not more than ten persons are employed, and they are all brought within the purview of this Bill. It is impossible that any ground more illogical can be taken up by hon. Gentlemen opposite. In other cases the burden is thrown upon the employer, and it is said he should protect himself by insurance. It is quite true that the accidents, owing to the increasing use of machinery in agriculture, are increasing, but the burden is almost insignificant. It is upon these grounds that I think a case has been made out and I trust the hon. Member who moved the Amendment will press it to a Division. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot help thinking that the Debate is a *réchauffé* of the Second Reading Debate on this Bill. Nothing new has been said, and I quite understand that there must necessarily remain a difference of opinion which can only be decided by a Division of the Committee. My right hon. Friend tells us that it would have been more loyal and more practical if the Government had included all trades in the Bill. Well, Sir, logic we have long ago given up in connection with this Bill. [*Opposition cheers.*] Indeed, I do think that it is the great advantage of English legislation that it does not pretend to be logical. And if the English Legislature ever did pretend to be logical, it would immediately find itself in the position of some foreign countries which have tried to be logical, and make the same mistakes those foreign countries have made. Our legislation would never be at all satisfying, it would never meet the varied conditions of English life, if it pretended to be logical. I am not at all, therefore, ashamed to plead guilty to the charge that the Bill is not logical. But when my right hon. Friends say that it would be more practical to include all these trades I confess that is a point upon which I entirely differ from them. It has been made a complaint against those who are opposing this Amendment that our arguments have been divergent; that while my right hon. Friend and myself have admitted that the claim of the agricultural labourer is a just one, and that it cannot be in itself distinguished from some other trades, my hon. Friends behind me have used altogether different arguments. They have used different arguments, but not arguments that are in any way inconsistent with ours. What my hon. Friends have said is this. They have not denied the justice of the claim made for the agricultural labourer, and I do not doubt that they would be willing to adopt the words of the Home Secretary on that point. But they say, be it just or unjust, in their opinion—and I think they are entitled to speak with authority—it would be inexpedient to apply it at the present moment. Why would it be inexpedient? It would be inexpedient in their opinion because it would undoubtedly lead to a lesser demand for labour and to the exclusion of many labourers who are now at work on the land, especially the older labourers. My right hon. Friend dismisses that argument in an airy way, and asks who will till the land. I might say that there is a great deal of land at the present moment that is not being tilled at all. ["Hear, hear!"] It has always been our desire, and I believe the desire of all who wish well to the agricultural labourer, to introduce a larger amount of labour on the land, and to secure that the land now untilled shall be brought into cultivation and that as much manual labour as possible shall be employed upon it. ["Hear, hear!"] Another point put forward by my hon. Friend is that in the case of an accident happening to an agricultural labourer employed by a small farmer, the compensation would ruin and destroy that farmer. "Oh," says my right hon. Friend, "he should insure." I quite agree. But does he think, from his own experience as a matter of fact, that if we were at once, while this principle is still new, and has hardly penetrated into the minds of employers of labour throughout the country—["hear, hear!"]—does he think that as a class the farmers will immediately rush off to the insurance offices? We are told that the offices themselves are not yet prepared, that they have not even made their scale of charges. Would it not be well—is it not reasonable to urge, in the interests of the labourers as well as of the farmers, that some time should be given to see what the effect of the Bill is to be, and gain experience of these same trades and employers to which my hon. Friend referred? Is it not wise to wait for that experience before we impose the burden on such a trade as that of agriculture? It has been admitted, and hon. Gentlemen opposite cheered it, that if we were to admit the agricultural labourers we should no longer have cause or reason for refusing to include workshops and the whole of the rest of the trades of the country. They cheered that enthusiastically. ["Hear, hear!" from the Opposition.] Well, I don't want to throw in their teeth their past action; but surely this is absolutely inconsistent with their past action. Take, for instance, the case of the agricultural labourer. What did they propose to do for the agricultural labourer? They proposed to give the agricultural labourer the advantages of the abolition of common employment. How many wounded labourers would have been helped in the course of a year by that? And, remember, that great boon—if boon it be—was to have been given to the agricultural labourer subject to litigation. The agricultural labourer who earns 8s. to 9s. a week was supposed to be able to prosecute his claim at an expense of perhaps £300 to £400 in law. I say that, as a matter of fact, in 1893 nothing was done for the agricultural labourer. In name something was done; in reality absolutely nothing. And at that time, as hon. Members recollect, I was urging upon the then Government that they should introduce this new principle which we are now recommending to the community. What was the answer? I am not complaining, but the answer at that time was that public opinion was not ripe. And now, when we do introduce it, when we are introducing what is admitted to be a very large Measure indeed, I find that all those hon. Gentlemen opposite who gave me no assistance then are all urging on the Government to include this and to include that. Is that a course really in the interest of the Bill? I address myself to hon. Gentlemen who are in favour of the Bill, and I ask them to deal with the Bill in a practical spirit. Do not they see—are not the signs of the times evident to them as they must be to everybody else—that to introduce a new principle of this kind is a great Parliamentary effort? We think we have carried that principle as far as we ought to be asked to do. But we do believe in our principle, and we shall continue to do so. We hope that as the result of experience a larger extension will be given to it after that experience has been fully before the country. But anybody who now presses us to introduce large additional classes, and at the same time involve ourselves in additional contests with those classes, can certainly not be called a true Friend of the Bill. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) agreed with his right hon. Friend who had just sat down that it was extremely difficult to introduce the agricultural labourer into the Bill. But the difficulty of introducing many of the small trades affected was exactly as great. The right hon. Gentleman objected that those who attacked the Bill asked for logic. But the very ground on which he defeated the Bill of the late Home Secretary was that a logical proposal ought to be made to include all trades in its operation. It seemed to him that the Government had gone too far, or not far enough —["hear, hear!"]—and that it was impossible to justify the line which had been drawn in the present Bill. He could not resist the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, and he should not support the Amendment. But he was bound to say that the agricultural industry was affected by the Bill as it stood; for a casual dairy hand working at a churn moved by water-power would come under the Bill as he worked in a "factory," and that there were many such places worked by only two or three poeple which would come under the Bill, and where all the difficulties referred to by hon. Members on the other side would present themselves. He could not resist the conclusion that the more they looked at the Bill the more they felt that Government were bound to come to some principle as to the responsibility for compensation generally, for the small employer could not bear the strain the Bill would thrust upon him. He was certain they would have to come to that presently; and the value of these discussions was that they would more and more educate the country to feel that it was impossible to justify the arbitrary lines of distinction that must be drawn in a Bill of this kind, and that they must ultimately come to the responsibility of the public or the State for the damages to be incurred. ["Hear, hear!"] The exclusion of the excluded trades would be much easier to justify if the Government had been prepared to introduce a Bill to improve the law as regarded the excluded trades. The right hon. Gentleman said he did not think the doctrine of common employment would affect the agricultural labourer. For his part, he believed that in all the serious accidents which befell the agricultural labourer he would find that it was common employment and contributory negligence which excluded them from compensation already. And when it was said that the agricultural labourer had no unions and would be unable to set the law in operation—was it not notorious that the law was set in operation at the present time on behalf of very poor labourers indeed, who had no unions, their cases being taken up as a speculation on the chance of getting damages. No, it was common employment and contributory negligence which did already exclude the agricultural labourer. Therefore, he held that the Government would be driven either to some form of recognition of public responsibility for loss in the case of a bankrupt employer, or else, if they continued to exclude certain trades, to improve the law with regard to the excluded trades.

*SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbright) said it had been suggested that as the Amendment would throw a burden on the land, the landlord would have to bear it. He did not object to it on that ground, but he did object to such legislation for Scotland at the present time, as many of the farms in Scotland—the greater part of the farms in the South of Scotland—were small farms held on a nineteen years' lease; and that being so, he held that the time had not arrived for the Bill to apply to Scotland. He could perfectly reconcile the different views which the right hon. Member for East Fife had referred to. But he contended that the Bill was not wanted, and there was no demand for it in the country. If there was a demand for it, he should be the last man to stand up against it, but there was none. There might be bad accidents in agricultural districts at times, but the sufferers were generally treated with great sympathy and liberality by employers and proprietors of the soil. Accidents, however, were extremely rare, and there was no reason for bringing the industry under the Act. The calculation of the number of accidents requirng hospital treatment was only one in three thousand in country districts. In the moorland districts of Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland there were practically no accidents; and he was quite sure that very few Scotch Members would rise in the House and say that it would promote the general good to include agriculture in the scope of the Bill. He was sure that the effect would be that many small farmers would employ no labour whatever. They would endeavour themselves to do all the labour that was required on their own land, many old hands would be put off, and the labourers would be far worse off in many cases under this Bill than they already were.

Mr. J. W. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire), in supporting the Amendment, observed that the Colonial Secretary had once more warned them against logic. He would suggest that before the right hon. Gentleman asked them to remove the logic mote from their eyes he might remove the logic beam from the eye of the Home Secretary. The whole argument of the Home Secretary came to this that they could not include agriculture, because if they did so they would be obliged to include other trades. He submitted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman was simply defending his position on purely logical grounds. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that there was no difference of opinion between the Front Bench and the hon. Gentlemen who sat behind. He submitted that there was. The Home Secretary said that he approved of the principle of including the agricultural labourer, but what he wanted them to do was to postpone that inclusion. He appealed to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Basingstoke (Mr. Jeffreys) who had used certain arguments against the inclusion of the agricultural labourer, and would ask him whether he did not think that his arguments would be just as effective two years hence as they were at present. If they would be then there was a difference of opinion between hon. and right hon. Gentlemen. The Colonial Secretary did, he admitted, give them one argument in his attempt to reconcile those two things. He said in effect, "Wait a little; if you wait a little the farmers will learn to insure; at the present moment they do not insure, but bye-and-bye if you give them a little more time they will learn the principle of insurance." He submitted that at present the farmers had learned the principle of insurance. He had many small farmers in his constituency and he found that they insured against the burning of a hay stack which would be as great a calamity as that of a man falling off a hay rick. If they could insure against the one risk, they would quickly learn to insure against the other. This Bill applied to steam. In Scotland they had an enormous number of traction threshing machines. The workmen employed at those machines were employed at a travelling factory which was as much a factory as the factories included in the Measure. It was said that if they included the agricultural labourer in the Act they would do harm to agriculture itself. But at the present moment the greatest problem they had to face was that they could not get the agricultural labourers to remain on the land. They were tempted to the large towns by the much greater inducements that they got there. The Government were now going to add to that difficulty. They were going to give a fresh attraction to employment in the towns, and the farmer would have a worse difficulty in getting labourers. ["Hear, hear!"] The President of the Board of Agriculture was doing—and rightly doing—all he could to encourage cattle breeding. Kincardineshire at one time was a great cattle-breeding district but it had ceased to be so, and one reason for that was that no farmer could breed cattle because he could not get a sufficient supply of female labour. He submitted that if this Measure was passed and the agricultural interest left out the farmer would find greater difficulty in getting labourers. ["Hear, hear!"]

*Lord WILLOUGHBY de ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) regretted that on this occasion he found himself not in line with the Government, but must support the Amendment of his hon. Friend. He was quite prepared to admit that a few of the oldest labourers, being more likely to suffer injury, might lose their employment, but he did not think that this should stand in the way of admitting the vast majority of agricultural labourers to the benefits of this Bill. His own feeling on this question was very strong. He believed the cost of insurance would be extremely small in the case of farm labourers, for almost all insurance companies would see perfectly well that there were very few risks which could occur to a farm labourer that were not brought about by his own fault and wilful negligence. There was the question of the small farmer, and as far as he was concerned he could not help thinking the landlords would have to look to themselves. A small farmer would be liable under this Bill, and if one of his labourers was killed or injured, he would suffer a very heavy loss unless he had insured. But it seemed to him that when he came with a farm agreement the landlord ought to see that such small farmer should insure his men. Personally, as far as he was concerned, in any estates he had to manage, he should make it a condition before such small farmers took a farm that they should produce the insurance policies for the one or two men they had to employ. He should be perfectly willing to deduct such cost from the rent, and he believed himself it would be a good thing for the landlords to act in this way, and for this reason. As the Bill stood if a man had to be called upon to pay a large sum it would mean practically ruin to the small farmer and the landlord would have a bankrupt tenant. But he considered the landlord was well able to look after his interest in that respect by making his small tenants insure the men he was likely to employ on his farm. He should support the Amendment of his hon. Friend in pursuance of a distinct pledge he had given to his constituents.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE remarked that it was a curious fact that those great industries whose employés had by their thrift obtained as good a position as they would have under the Bill were already included in the Measure. He spoke specially with regard to the industry he was connected with in Northumberland and Durham. He defied any man to show that the men who might meet with an accident or the widows of men who might be killed would not by the exertions of the men themselves and the help of their employers, be in as good a position as they would be under this Bill. Yet the Government had chose that industry and left out one which was worse off. Then with regard to the railways, they were included in the Bill, when it was well known that in connection with one or two of the larger companies the men would, by their own savings and care and by the help of the shareholders, be in a good position in the event of accidents happening, perhaps not so good as they would be in if the Bill were to pass into law. Under these circumstances it was a monstrous thing that those poor men in the agricultural industry, who earned worse wages than the railway men or the men engaged in the mines were to be left out in the cold. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said that the day of logic had gone by. The day of equity, however, and of care, and of honesty of purpose had not gone by. He thought the views of a great many hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side would change towards this Bill by the time the Third Reading stage was reached unless equity and public morality were carried to their full extent.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.) had always been of opinion that if once the House accepted the broad principle upon which this Bill was based, before many years were over it would be absolutely necessary in logic and in justice to give to every labourer in the country the right of compensation. At the same time he was quite convinced that the Government had taken the wisest and most prudent course in not applying the Bill —which was professedly experimental— at present to such industries as that of agriculture. The Bill had been discussed on the basis of large employments, to which the system of insurance could be more easily and cheaply applied. But in extending the Bill to such industries as agriculture they would have to do with a class of small employers. They knew by experience that the farmers were very slow to adopt new habits and he thought it was most desirable, both in their interests and in the interest of agriculture as a whole, that they should have time to see those new principles of insurance applied before they were called upon to apply them themselves. The question had been raised whether the application of this Bill would or would not be beneficial to the agricultural labourer. He thought that entirely depended upon whether the employers of the agricultural labourer insured generally or did not. He felt quite confident that if they did not insure—and in the first instance, at all events, the great majority of them, he believed, would prefer to run the risks of accidents rather than insure—that state of things would not be beneficial to the agricultural labourer as a whole. A farmer might be called upon to pay, perhaps, £300 down. Having no ready money, he would be unable to pay, and that would bring his creditors down upon him, and he would become insolvent, so that, not only would the injured man not get any compensation, but the other labourers in the employ of the farmer would lose their work. He thought that the principle introduced in this Bill ought not to be applied in a hurry to small employments. The statesmanlike course was first of all to apply this principle to the larger industries to see how it worked, and then gradually to bring within its scope the labourers in the other industries. It might be found necessary to introduce some form of State aid before it was applied to small employers, but he felt sure that the Bill as it stood could not be applied in the way it was now sought to apply it, and he should have no hesitation in voting against the Amendment.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said he intended to support the Amendment, not only because he was an agricultural Member, but also because he was an admirer of the logic displayed by the Government. He could not but admire the serpentine wisdom of the Government in the framing of this Bill. The Debate had shown that if the Government had included agricultural labourers, there were a large number of friends of the agricultural labourers on the Government side of the House who would prevent the passing of the Bill.

Mr. HARRY FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft) said that, as representing an agricultural constituency, he was deeply disappointed at the decision of the Government. He was sure that every agricultural Member on the Government side would endorse every word which fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. ["No, no!"] The Government admitted the justice of the claim, and the right hon. Gentleman merely enforced it by pointing out that the agricultural labourers, above all classes, were least able to provide against accident. It was said on the Second Reading that there was no demand on the part of agricultural labourers for inclusion in the Bill. There was, on the contrary, a very strong demand for it on their part, and he confessed that he would find the greatest difficulty in explaining to his constituents why they were excluded. He would venture to ask one question of the Government. They were told that the Bill was an experiment, and when it had worked a certain time agriculture was to be included. He had not yet heard what was to be considered a reasonable time. ["Divide, divide!"] Hon. Members might shout "Divide!" but he had risen to discharge a duty, and he asked the Government what they considered a reasonable time in which to reconsider the question of the inclusion of agriculture? This was the third Session of this Parliament. What chance was there that during its continuance this question would be considered? The agricultural industry was one of the greatest industries of the country, and he would like to know on what ground they were to tell their constituents they were not to be included in the Bill? He felt bound to support the Amendment.

Sir W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) did not agree that this was a great question of justice. It was a question of common sense. ["Hear, hear!"] It was perfectly obvious that a Measure of this magnitude should first be tried in connection with those industries in which the workers incurred the greatest amount of hazard. Looking to the great crisis through which agriculture was passing, he believed the House could not take a more hazardous step than to include agricultural labourers in the Bill. It was clear that, if agriculture was to keep its head above water, it could only do so by the multiplication of small holdings. If that were so, by the application of this Bill to agriculture, the difficulties of the situation would be greatly aggravated. He thought that was a substantial reason why the House should pause before they applied the principle of the Measure to the agricultural system. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. HENRY BROADHURST (Leicester) said his colleagues representing labour in the House would agree with him when he said that the artisans asked for no benefit or protection which was not given to their colleagues the farm labourers. His first criticism on the Bill was that it did not include that class. They did not ask for logic. They knew they would not get that, but what they did ask for was that the poorest class of labourers in the country, those who had the least means of protecting themselves, should be included in this great Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] Small farmers understood insurance as well as large farmers or manufacturers. They had insured under the Act of 1880. There would be no ruination, no men would be discharged on account of this Bill. Old men were now employed, not on account of philanthropy, but because younger men could not be found. He hoped the Committee might have a definite assurance as to the time when the amending Bill would be introduced.

*Mr. C. T. GILES (Cambridge, Wisbech) said he found it very difficult indeed to discuss this Bill and to come to a conclusion as to the inclusion of agricultural labourers from lack of information as to the way it would affect farmers, small owners, and occupiers, and even labourers themselves. This question having been raised by Amendment, there had been no opportunity to ascertain the views of those interested in the matter. Agricultural labourers incurred greater dangers than persons employed in many factories, and on that and other grounds were certainly entitled to a Compensation for Accidents Bill. But if agricultural labourers were included in the Bill, they could not well exclude seamen, persons employed in workshops, and the building trade. [*Opposition cheers.*] He was decidedly in favour of the principle of workers in all these industries being compensated for accidents, but this Bill did not seem applicable to them. Some form of State insurance would be necessary. He trusted the Government would bring in a Bill which would include the industries excluded from the present Bill, and he would do all he could to urge them to do so.

*Mr. J. G. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty), speaking amidst cries of "Divide!" said he was disappointed that agricultural labourers were excluded from the Bill. The hon. Baronet the Member for Kirkcudbright said there was no call for the Bill in Scotland. That may be his opinion, but there could, he thought, be no question that the use of machinery was increasing amongst the large farmers, of whom there were many in the eastern part of Ross-shire. The Royal Commission on Deer Forests had shown that there were two million acres of uncultivated land in the Highlands. [*Cries of* "Question!"] There was no question about it. [*Laughter and cheers.*] Let there be more small farms in the Highlands, and let the landlords pay the insurance premium for the protection of the farmers against any liability for compensation arising through accidents to farm servants. He hoped the Government would afford compensation for accidents to agricultural labourers not only in Scotland, but in England. ["Hear, hear!"]

Question put, "That the word 'agriculture' be inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 123; Noes, 175.—(Division List, No. 226.)

Mr. S. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow) moved, after the word "quarry," to insert the word "shop." He said that the Amendment would bring within the scope of the Bill a very large body of working men and women. In the City of London alone there were 100,000 persons engaged in work in shops. They were exposed to certain risks—for example, risks of lift accidents—and he held that they ought to be included in the Bill.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment. The Committee had rejected the proposal to include agricultural labourers, and *a fortiori*, unless this Bill was to be made absolutely comprehensive, it would not be reasonable to include shop assistants. The Committee, of course, sympathised with all classes of workers who were liable to injuries from accidents, but if the question were regarded from a practical point of view, he thought it would be admitted that this Bill ought not to be extended in the direction desired by the hon. Member.

Mr. S. WOODS said that after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman he realised that it would be useless for him to press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir F. EVANS (Southampton) moved, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "ship." Considerable complaints, he said, had been heard as to the supposed oppressiveness of the Measure upon particular trades. Wishing to find out how it would affect the industry with which he was connected, he had caused calculations to be made showing how his company would have been affected if the Bill had been in operation since 1891, and had extended to seamen, firemen, and ships' servants. Those calculations showed that for the last six years the annual charge necessary to meet all risks under the Bill would not have exceeded £400. In his opinion the Bill, by fixing the compensation payable for injuries, would be advantageous to employers. The difficulty of employers at present was to gauge the amount that they ought to pay in cases of accidents. Under this Bill, if seamen and firemen were included, shipowners would know exactly what they would have to pay. The company with which he was connected had 90,000 tons of shipping, and on the average about 130 men per ship, yet, as he had said, the gross charge for accidents would not exceed £400 a year. Experience with "tramp" vessels, as distinguished from "liners," showed that the cost would have been not more than double, and he pointed out that the risk could easily be insured against. There were so few cases of permanent incapacity that he was of opinion that they might almost be left out of consideration. Forty years ago the company with which he was connected lost one ship and a portion of her crew off the coast of Africa, but since then there had been no case of total loss. If seamen and firemen were included, he felt it would be an additional inducement to them to come into the service. He entirely disagreed with the argument that a special Act was necessary to deal with seamen. The Merchant Shipping Acts of this country which applied to seamen applied only to questions of detail which had nothing at all to do with the principle at stake in this Bill. ["Hear, hear!"] He asked for the inclusion of these men as an employer of these men —[*cheers*]—and surely the Government could not but aid him. He was willing to accept their Bill just as it stood; and there was no shipowner in the country who, if he would make the calculations which he himself had made, would not be glad to accept the principle. He begged to move his Amendment. [*Cheers.*]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I feel that the hon. Gentleman is a friend of this Bill, and I would add that his desire to include his own trade in the Bill is much more defensible than the attitude of some other employers who desire to exclude their trades. ["Hear, hear!"] At the same time, I think he has minimised the difficulties in our way, which would not apply, I doubt not, to such businesses as he is himself connected with. We all know that the state of things in the great lines is altogether different from that in the average shipping of the country, and that passenger ships are remarkably free from accidents of any kind. We cannot say the same thing, unfortunately, of the mass of the merchant trade. There are other matters, which suggest themselves to anyone, which point to a very considerable difference between trades on land and trades on sea. I will give one single case, for I do not intend to labour the question. A man engages for a long voyage, he is away, perhaps, for six months; in the course of the voyage he meets with an accident, and he is laid up for three months. If he were a workman on land he would have to provide for himself, to get his own medical attendance, his own food, and lodging. But the man who is rendered absolutely useless, say, for a term of three months, on board ship is kept and paid his wages, and has such medical attendance as the ship can afford for the whole of that period. Any one who thinks the matter out will see that there are very marked differences between the shipping trade and trades on land. The Government considered that to put this vast industry into a Bill of this kind would be to overload it. What we have said about the agricultural labourers we say with infinitely greater force with regard to shipping. We cannot undertake the responsibility of admitting into a Bill of this kind, which introduces this principle for the first time, such a trade as the shipping trade, which would enormously complicate the issues and greatly increase the opposition and friction with which we have to deal. Therefore our position is that, while we do not include it in the Bill, we recognise that the condition of things with regard to the shipping trade will not be satisfactory, and that, therefore, sooner or later—we hope sooner rather than later—it will be the duty of the Government to deal with it.

SIR ARTHUR FORWOOD (Lancashire, Ormskirk) said he must express disappointment at the tone of his right hon. Friend and at the reception he had given to this proposal. ["Hear, hear!"] He, for one, as a shipowner, was not prepared to throw the onus of responsibility as regards compensation for accidents on other employers which he was not prepared to accept himself. [*Opposition cheers.*] If there was one industry in the country which could have been brought without difficulty into the Bill it was the shipping industry. He took it that this Bill did not provide that a man should receive relief when incapacitated and full wages as well. He thought that if his right hon. Friend had realised the great dangers and suffering attendant on this industry he would have given the Committee a more definite assurance that, at any rate, at an early date—say, next Session—a Measure dealing with shipping would be brought in. There was nothing to be found out in regard to shipping—they had plenty of statistics. ["Hear, hear!"] At present the burden of the accidents which happened fell on those who were least able to bear it—the employés. He thought the capitalists ought to be called on to share the burden. ["Hear, hear!"] He had gone very carefully through the Blue-books to ascertain what the cost would be to owners, and he found that less than 6d. per man per week would amply provide a fund which would meet the loss of life through casualties and the inevitable accidents which happened at sea. Moreover, the shipping interest was exceedingly well organised, and all the systems of insurance were available to protect the small shipowner, who was not prepared to take these responsibilities. If there was one industry which was more thoroughly equipped to undertake this liability than another it was the shipping industry. He was bound to accept the decision of the Government, but he protested against its omission, and urged the Government, not later than next Session, to introduce a Bill dealing with merchant shipping on at least as liberal lines as were proposed in this Bill.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said it was very remarkable that the desire which had been expressed by two shipowners who were well known and respected in that House should be neglected. He felt certain that there would be no dissent from those views by other shipowners present. ["Hear, hear!"] The inclusion of shipping would not necessitate the extension of the Bill to other trades. If by its inclusion certain Amendments would be necessary in the schedule and elsewhere, he felt sure no appreciable time would be lost, as the Committee generally would be ready to accept them. It was true that shipowners of the class represented by his hon. Friend behind him included the *élite* of the shipping trade, and it was because they had brought the shipping trade to this state of perfection that they would not be involved in any large expenditure for compensation; but what the Committee had to look to was the other portion of the shipping trade, where the same care was not taken, and in connection with which the real advantage of the Bill would be felt.

Sir EDWARD HILL (Bristol, S.) said that in former years he had been a supporter of a universal system of compensation to all workmen for all accidents, and he was so still. He had drafted Amendments to the Bill of the late Home Secretary, and he was now surprised to find that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who then gave him no assistance were now anxious to see all classes of labour included. Whatever the cost of accidents at sea might be, he thought that the cost should be borne by the shipowner, and he was prepared to vote in this direction. If, moreover, it were a question now whether or not sailors should be included in the benefits of the Bill he would be prepared to vote for it; but that was not the question. The question was whether it was desirable sailors should be brought under this Bill or under the Bill suggested by the Colonial Secretary next year, which would be more suited to the peculiarities of employment at sea. It must be manifest that there was a considerable difference in the employment at sea as compared with the employment on land. Shipowners had already adopted the principle he had indicated by forming themselves into a federation which comprised three-fourths of the tonnage owned in the country, and these shipowners had given of their own accord compensation to the sailors serving in their ships in all accidents. He wanted the Bill to pass because he believed it would be of enormous benefit to the working classes, while the burden on the employer would not be so heavy as some anticipated. Though in favour, therefore, of universal compensation, he believed that the Government had done wisely in introducing this Measure tentatively. There would be little difficulty hereafter in extending the principle of the Bill further, and especially after it had been in operation for some time. He could not support the Amendment.

Mr. J. SAMUEL (Stockton) thought that the argument of the hon. Member was very inconsistent. If the Government were to include the shipping trade it was clear from the speeches which had been made that there would be no opposition from the shipowners themselves. The Colonial Secretary urged that the Bill should be applied to the dangerous trades of the country, but statistics showed that the shipping trade was the most dangerous of any calling. Under the Factory and Workshops Act during the last ten years the loss of life had been 4,000; in mines 11,000; and at sea 22,000. The Bill might tend to reduce the loss of life and the number of accidents by causing employers to be more careful in guarding machinery, and the same observation would equally apply to the care which would be imposed upon shipowners in looking after the welfare of the seamen in their ships. He protested against the decision of the Government in excluding seamen from the provisions of the Bill.

[After the usual interval, Mr. Grant Lawson (York, N.R., Thirsk) took the Chair.]

Sir H. S. KING (Hull, Central) said he was in favour of the extension of the Bill to all seamen without exception; but, assuming that the Government persevered in their hostility to the Amendment, he hoped they would so far listen to the sweet charms of logic as to include within the operation of the Bill all persons employed on ships in port or harbour. By the next clause of the Bill protection was extended to men employed at wharves, docks, and quays; and, that being so, surely it was illogical to exclude men working on ships in port or harbour.

Mr. E. H. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that as he understood the Bill it would have the effect of protecting persons who were engaged in loading or unloading a ship if that ship was drawn up by the side of a dock or quay; but, if that ship was in the centre of a dock or anchored in mid-stream and was being unloaded by a lighter, there was no such protection. That was a distinction that must arouse the opposition of London Members especially. ["Hear, hear!"] It was grossly inconsistent to protect a docker when he was loading or unloading a ship drawn up by the side of a dock or quay and to give him no protection when he was engaged in the far more dangerous occupation of unloading a vessel into a lighter.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL did not think that as the Bill now stood a ship in mid-stream would be included, but he understood his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary proposed to introduce words later on which would include a ship lying at a quay.

Mr. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) asked what would happen in the case of a vessel which was loading corn, say, by means of an elevator within 9 feet of the dock side?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that the words to be introduced would cover the case of vessels being unloaded at the quay by machinery.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.) asked what would happen in the case of a vessel partially unloaded in mid-stream and partially in dock?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said that it was perfectly obvious from what he had previously said that the operation in mid-stream would not be covered by the Act, but that alongside the quay would be included.

Sir H. S. KING stated that there were a hundred and one operations performed when a ship came in which, being under the supervision of the employer, ought to be covered by the Bill. If in order, he would move to amend the Amendment by adding after the word "ship" the words "while in any port or harbour of the United Kingdom."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Grant Lawson) remarked that such a proposal would be perfectly in order.

*Mr. HARRISON said the Attorney General had reminded the Committee that in the selection of trades or occupations the promoters had proceeded on the lines of including those trades or occupations in respect of which protection and insurance were the most accessible. The shipping trade, therefore, was most suitable for inclusion in the Bill, for it was a matter of almost common knowledge that ship owners had agreed upon a system of universal insurance. Why should the shipping industry be excluded? There could be no reason why the Bill should not be extended to an industry which all those interested in it were perfectly willing it should be extended to. He trusted that under the circumstances the Government would assent to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Southampton, and would not limit it, as proposed by the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Central Division of Hull.

*Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that although there seemed a consensus of opinion that it would be well if they could extend the Bill to ships actually lying next to a quay, it was evident that the present Amendment could not be adopted by the House. Its terms were wide enough to include the channels of the Mersey, where collisions were not infrequent. The Government had done well in restricting the Bill to a limited number of classes of employment. It would have been very easy to earn a certain amount of popularity by enlarging the Bill, but he was glad that the Government were very carefully scrutinising every Amendment. He was perfectly prepared to approach the question of the insurance of seamen with an open mind, for he felt certain that the principle must be extended to all classes of workers systematically. For years past, however, seamen had been treated in a different category to other workmen. Why should they now be included in this experimental Measure? It must be remembered that seamen were not all of one nationality, and that of itself was a reason why they should be treated differently from other classes of workmen. He thought the Government were right in taking a firm stand. If they did think fit to include seamen strict words should be inserted providing that when a ship had started on her voyage she should not come under the purview of the Bill. During the Debate important and successful ship owners had spoken in favour of a universal system of insurance for sailors, but he did not think the House ought to consider that their evidence covered the whole shipping interest. The hon. Member for Southampton spoke of 40 years' experience free from accident. The hon. Member was a very happy man, and the Chairman of a very happy company, but there were a crowd of companies managed with as much care as the hon. Member's who had not had equal happiness and success. He did not think the gay manner in which the hon. Member proposed that this Bill should be extended as a result of his own happy experience justified the Committee in thinking that all ship owners were of the same opinion. A few years ago the hon. Member for Ormskirk told the House there was no analogy between the management of a coal mine and the navigation of a ship, and asserted that the two ought not to be dealt with in the same Bill. He thought there were sufficient grounds why they should move slowly in a measure of this kind. He believed there was so much truth in the principle that assuredly the longer it worked the more effective it would be, and that there would be no permanent objection on the part of the shipowners to be subject, in a future Act, to the principle of this Bill.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough) was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. Gentleman opposite, who said he represented the seamen, venturing to advise the House to reject the claim which had emanated from two shipowners of great prominence in that House. He was there to fight for the seamen having this Bill. Since 1880 they had been excluded from the protection of the Employers' Liability Act, and he felt sure, from what he knew of the sea, that, had they had that protection, hundreds, perhaps thousands of men who had met their death at sea would have been alive to-day. The hon. Gentleman opposite said there was a great difference between employment on shore and employment at sea—that the shipowner could not exercise control when the ship was at sea. That was an argument, he ventured to say, which would not hold good for a moment. The shipowner, he held, was in exactly the same position as the mine owner. So long as the captain was on board the ship representing the owner, the owner's interests were well represented equally as much as the interests of the mine owner. Perhaps more so, because of late years a system had sprung up in the shipping trade whereby no captain could get employment on a tramp steamer unless he was prepared to introduce £500 or £1,000 for the purpose. Consequently one of the part owners were on board the ship, and he knew as a matter of fact that on the bulk of the tramp steamers to-day, the engineers, captain, and officers were compelled to be shareholders before they got their command. Would any one say then, that the owners were not well represented on board these ships? The Colonial Secretary used an argument which very much surprised him. The right hon. Gentleman said that when a seaman was injured on board ship he was in an altogether different position from the man on shore, because the seaman might be injured at the commencement of a long voyage and would continue on board for three or four months, and his wages would be paid for the whole time. Where did the hardship come upon the shipowner in that case? He did not take on any fresh men. The men who were left on the ship had to do the work of that man, and consequently no hardship fell upon the shipowner through the man being laid aside. But he would point out to the Colonial Secretary that the bulk of the work was carried on in steamers, and it was seldom that more than 15 days elapsed between a steamer leaving one port and reaching another. The moment that ship arrived in port the injured seaman was put ashore and his wages ceased at once. All the shipowner was responsible for after that man was landed was the hospital expenses and his conveyance home to the United Kingdom at the rate of 3s. a day. They had been told from both sides of the House that a special protection was given to the seaman that was not given to the working man. He ventured to say that there was more protection afforded to the miner under the Coal Mines' Regulation Act and to the operative under the Factory Act than was given to the seaman under the Shipping Act. The Colonial Secretary had stated that "we have applied the principle in the first place where there are the most accidents," and that "every trade which may fairly be called dangerous is included." He found from the Board of Trade Returns for May that for one month the number of men killed on the railroads was 27; in mines, 64; in quarries, 10; and seamen, 191. These figures, taking the test of the Secretary for the Colonies, constituted the highest claim for the extension of the protection of the Bill to seamen. But if they compared these figures with the number of men employed in these several industries the result was even more startling. There were 370,000 men employed on the railroads; in mines, over 700,000; in factories and workshops, close upon 5,000,000 people were engaged, while the number engaged at sea varied from 180,000 to 200,000. If a monthly death-roll of 191 out of a total employment of 200,000 was not a strong argument in favour of this Bill being extended to seamen, he should like to know what was. Would it be a hardship to apply this Bill to shipowners? He did not think it would. An ordinary tramp steamer that was not worth more than £12,000, ac-according to present value, would be insured for £16,000 or £17,000. Therefore, if the shipowner lost that vessel he made a clear profit of £5,000. Would it be any hardship in that case to pay out of that £5,000 a little to the widows and orphans of the men who had been drowned with that vessel, whether the owner was responsible or not? Another point which ought to carry weight with the Committee was the fact that shipowners paid no poor rates. No matter if a ship was worth £100,000, he did not pay a penny of poor rate, although if they had a mine worth £100,000, the owner would probably pay from £5,000 to £10,000 a year in poor rate. There was no poorhouse in which they would not find a large number of seamen—young men, injured for life—kept there at the expense of the ratepayers, while the ships from which these men came and on which they were injured, did not pay a single farthing of poor rate. He found that every day large numbers of seamen were injured on board ship through carelessness on the part of officers. Were those officers dismissed? No, they were kept on, and no notice was taken. Why, if sailors were killed on board ship, there was no inquiry whatever. Hundreds of men were killed on board ship; the vessel arrived home, and unless one of the crew made a special report to the superintendent no notice whatever was taken. True, it was entered in the official log, which went to the Registrar General; but they had no special right to make inquiries into these accidents, and no notice was taken of them. If ever there was a body of men deserving the protection of this Bill, it was the seamen. The special protection of the Shipping Act! One hon. Member ventured to tell the House that seamen should not have the Bill, because the owners were compelled to provide medical and surgical attendance on board ship. On hearing that, one would suppose that every ship carried a doctor. As a matter of fact, the only ships which carried doctors were those carrying over 100 persons. Where did the medical attendance come in? Not one captain out of a hundred could set a limb; and if a man got a limb broken on board a sailing vessel, on a passage, he had to lie in agony two or three months, and when he was landed, probably through the neglect he had suffered, he was obliged to have it cut off. He had found a large number of unfortunate men injured on board sailing ships while on long passages, who were cripples to this day—young men many of them. Then for the medical part of the business. A lot of knowledge the captains and officers had about medicine! Why, they had only one remedy for every injury a seaman was liable to, and that was a dose of salts [*Laughter.*] That was absolutely safe. [*Laughter.*] Why he had known them give a man with a broken leg a dose of salts. [*Much laughter.*] And then they were told that because seamen got medical attendance they should not be included in this Bill! Then as to the funeral expenses. Well, he had not yet found the ship that carried a full-rigged undertaker on board. They did not carry mourning coaches, nor did they carry coffins to fit every man. If a sailor had the misfortune to die at sea, they stitched him up in a few yards of canvas—old canvas preferred—and they threw him overboard before his body was cold. [*Cries of* "Order!"] Yes, but he was answering the arguments of hon. Gentlemen who had made use of these statements about medical assistance and so on, as a reason why seamen should not have the Bill. It might not be palatable, but it was true; and when these arguments were brought up to induce the House to deny seamen the right to the protection of this Bill he was entitled to answer them. A ship owner said, "I fit my vessel out and send her away thousands of miles, and I have no control over her." He maintained that he had as much control over his ship when she was at sea as a mine owner who might be in Egypt had over his mine in this country. ["Hear, hear!"] It had been said that the Bill might be applied to seamen when in English ports. That would be simply a farce; because as soon as the ship arrived in a British port the crew were discharged within 24 hours. In fact they ceased to work as soon as the vessel was made fast alongside the dock; they were paid off at once, and all claim on the owner ceased. It would be simply a farce, therefore, to apply the Bill to the men when they were no longer connected with the ship in any way. He should be sorry if the question of the dockers and that of seamen were mixed up in this Debate. The question of the dockers was already apart from the question of seamen and ships. This Bill would apply undoubtedly to all ships lying alongside the quay or wharf in docks, but not to ships in mid-stream or to ships discharging in the centre of a dock. Now in the port of Hull, a large part of the work connected with ships was done in the centre of the dock, when the vessels were being discharged into lighters; and as the Bill stood at present it would not apply to the men so engaged. And then on the Thames there was a large amount of work carried on in mid-stream, and in that case, the work was far more dangerous than when the vessels were lying at quay, because at quay they had the use of cranes, whereas in mid-stream they used the gear of the vessel, and there was not the same supervision over a ship's gear as over the cranes on the quays. But, as he had said, he hoped they would keep the cases of the seamen and dockers apart, because the seamen had a special claim to come under the Bill. And after it had been asked for by two of the leading ship owners in the country, he could not understand the Government at all. If the ship owners had come down in a body, and opposed the Bill the same as the mine owners had done, he could have understood the position of the Government. They had the ship owners saying "Give us this Bill," but the Government said, "No, we can't; we must experiment on the mine owners, because they don't want it." That was a funny position for the Government to take—a very clear one no doubt. In the past ten days he had seen large deputations of mine owners lobbying Members of the House of Commons and asking them to oppose the Bill. They had seen nothing of the kind on the part of the ship owners. In fact, all the respectable ship owners were desirous—[*laughter*]—there was no mistake about it, it was perfectly true, all the respectable shipowners were in favour of the Bill being applied to seamen. It was only the managing owners who had ventured to pass a resolution or two and send up a petition—a very badly drawn petition it was—[*laughter*]—using arguments that would not hold water for a moment, about funeral expenses and medical expenses on board ship. He intended to press this thing to a Division and to fight it every inch of the way. He had been asking for 16 years that the seamen should be given justice by extending the Employers' Liability Act to them; and now in Her Majesty's great Jubilee year they were still to be left out. Was it because seamen had no votes? The miners could vote in a solid body and make their Members sit up. [*Laughter.*] But if seamen had no votes, they knew the men who had got them; and one thing was certain—they would take particular care of the Division List and would know how to talk to those gentlemen who refused them justice. [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

*Colonel DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said the final remark of the hon. Member for Middlesbrough reminded him of a similar remark he made to himself in private about two years ago.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: That was a private conversation.

*Colonel DENNY: Let it be private, then. He would only say that, representing a constituency which included a seaport town, he would challenge the hon. Member to go down there and say what he had just said in the House.

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: I will go down with you next week, if you will.

*Colonel DENNY said no Member of that House would be moved by threats. There were very grave reasons why sailors should not be included in the Bill; and if the ship owners had not agitated it was because the Government had given a solemn pledge that the Bill should not be extended to shipping. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]

Mr. HAVELOCK WILSON: Have they given a pledge? [Hon. Members: "Yes!"]

*Colonel DENNY said a pledge was given on the Second Reading; otherwise very distinct representations would have been made on behalf of the ship owners.

Sir F. EVANS: I deny that there is such a feeling. If there is such a feeling it ought to be given expression to on the floor of the House of Commons, so that we may all know it. It is no argument that the hon. Member should state that the Government have given a pledge which is entirely unknown to me or any of my friends.

*Colonel DENNY: I think I am entirely justified. The Attorney General will correct me if I am wrong in saying that the Secretary for the Colonies stated that it was not the Government's intention to apply this Bill to seamen. ["Hear, hear!"]

Sir F. EVANS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. I would not do so if I had not particular reasons. [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Grant Lawson): The hon. Member ought not to make the interruption. This is the second time he has done so.

Sir F. EVANS: Solely on the question of the pledge, nothing else. [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

*Colonel DENNY: The statement was made on the floor of this House by the Secretary for the Colonies—I believe I am correct—and the Home Secretary repeated it. That was a very strong reason why ship owners should not be included; but even if that were not the case, the objection to it was very strong. The ship owners' organisation was greatly opposed to this Measure. If the Government fulfilled their promise and brought in a Bill to meet the wants of the seamen, then this could be done. Let them take his own case. In their own works they were entirely responsible for the overseers whom they appointed. They were in easy reach of their places of business. But on board ship everything was provided, and every care taken that the sailor should have a safe voyage. None of these precautions prevailed ashore; they were obliged to carry out their business without any assistance from the Government. Suppose a ship went to sea and was absent for six months, it might return in an entirely different condition from that in which it started. The hon. Member for Southampton told them that £400 would cover his expenses under this Bill. He knew the hon. Member's fleet, and confirmed every word he said about it. A man who went down to the sea in such ships did not run more, perhaps not so much, risk as a man walking about the streets. ["Hear, hear!"] He hoped the hon. Member did not say that at no time could there be a loss through accident. Take the case of a railway manager stating that they had never had an accident, and the reply to that was, "Your time has not come yet." And that was true, for according to the doctrine of chance, certain accidents must happen regardless of all care. They would find two ships equally well provided, and one would come back free and the other with a very serious accident. He admitted that as to these great lines they had everything to be proud of; but the bulk of the shipping was in other and smaller hands. It was in the hands often of owners who had one or two ships only, and their responsibilities would not be met by £1, but by scores of pounds, and even hundreds. No owner outside of the House had yet made his voice heard, and when they were considering legislation of that scope they should look farther than mere individuals. After the statement made by the Colonial Secretary and repeated by the Home Secretary, that the ship owners would not be called within the scope of the Bill, he did not think it would be fair to insert this Amendment.

Mr. WALTON (Leeds, S.) said as it was almost hopeless to expect to get the Amendment carried in its present form he hoped the Government would accept it when modified. He proposed to move an Amendment to confine the Bill to all men employed upon vessels on inland waters.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Grant Lawson) said it would be inconvenient to propose another Amendment at this stage. It could be prepared later.

*Sir C. DILKE said some hon. Members seemed to think that a definite pledge had been given by the Government not to include sailors. He had listened attentively to the Debate, and he had not heard such a pledge given, and no such pledge had been given. The Government had introduced the Bill without ships in it. They had to give reasons for the form in which they introduced the Bill, and no doubt they gave the best reasons which occurred to them, which were that it had never been the practice to bring seamen under Bills of this kind.

> "there is sufficient reason, I think, for excluding them, but the Government are not indisposed to listen to arguments which may be brought forward for their inclusion."

He thought, therefore, they might dismiss from their minds any idea about a pledge. No doubt if the Committee were to include ships in the Bill, and make a considerable change the ship-owning class would have some reason for asking that there should be time given it to make its voice heard in the matter. But ships to some small and limited extent came within the Bill at the present time, because they were factories. They were included in the Bill when they were discharging or receiving cargo from the dock by means of machinery. They were factories when discharging in a dock, but not when discharging into lighters, and in the latter case the Act did not apply. So that compensation would apply in the case of machinery used on board the ships for discharging in the dock if a man was injured in that process, but if he was injured during a corresponding process by the same machinery when discharging into a lighter lying on the other side he would not receive compensation under the Bill. The Government made a plausible defence on the Second Reading for resisting an Amendment of this kind stating that shipping had never been included in factory legislation with the exception he had indicated, and that ships ought to be dealt with by a separate Bill. He should be perfectly prepared to accept that view so put forward on behalf of the Government, if they had any certain or firm belief that the Government were going to deal with the matter by means of a separate Bill. But when they asked some questions with regard to the introduction of the Bill this year, or next even, they were put off and told that at some very distant date the thing might be done. In other words, he thought that by some future Government it might be done, rather than by the present administration. While he, for one, should be inclined to listen to anything the Government had to say as a reason for dealing with the matter in a separate Bill, he could not accept that as a reason for not supporting this excellent Amendment, when they had nothing approaching a definite pledge as to dealing with the matter. The fact was the Government were afraid of the ship owners. Some of their Members having burned their fingers on former occasions when dealing with the shipping trade they were perhaps a little afraid of including them in this Bill. The Government feared to introduce the shipping trade on the first introduction of the Bill because that might have overweighted the Bill and produced a pressure of opinion against it in that House. Would the Government mind so much if the Committee themselves were to take the bull by the horns and introduce shipping into the Bill? He doubted it. He did not believe that the Government would object to having this Amendment forced upon them by the feeling of the House itself. Shipping was one of those industries which ought to come into this Bill, considered as an experimental Measure. Those reasons which had been advanced for the exclusion of the agricultural labourers from the Bill were the very reasons which called for the inclusion of seamen. The shipping industry was a great and wealthy industry where, in the main, the employers were persons or companies more substantial than the average employers in other trades, and above all they had the practice of insurance always present to them. Every company engaged in the shipping industry was constantly in the habit of insuring. They were including in the Bill all sorts of industries which were not dangerous. They were told that the object of the Government was to include those industries in which the most accidents occurred. Here was one in which most accidents occurred, yet in the case of this great industry which came so thoroughly within the provisions of a tentative Bill, the matter was excluded. The only reason could be that the Government must have shrank originally from including this great industry in the Bill for fear of the opposition which the Measure might be exposed to on that account. But the Government could not mind if the Committee were to force this view upon them, and the Government having given no sort of pledge to deal with the matter themselves in the course of the next year or two by a separate Bill, hon. Members, in the absence of such a pledge, were bound to support the proposal which had been made.

Sir DONALD CURRIE (Perthshire,W.) was in favour of the Amendment to the Amendment which would apply the Bill to vessels in a port whether in mid-stream or otherwise. He must not be supposed for one moment to be objecting to the inclusion of sailors in the benefits of compensation — ["hear, hear!"] — but he thought they should not be included in this Bill. A special Bill was really required, and that Bill should be brought in as speedily as possible, and he should be glad to support it with all his power. The Government had the responsibility for this Bill, and they suggested that it would be endangered if other trades were included. Upon them must be the responsibility. He wished to do nothing to hinder the passage of this Bill, and he thought there was sufficient danger before it to make hon. Members careful not to hamper its progress in any way with additional complications. His hon. Friend the Member for Middlesbrough (Mr. J. H. Wilson) spoke of a case in which a hatch was left off by the fault of the officers, and said that if a man was injured in consequence he would be all right if he came within the scope of this Bill. But he submitted that if it was the fault of the officers, the owner was already liable. He ventured to hope the House would adopt the Amendment to the Amendment. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that if the House was really desirous of carrying out this Amendment, it appeared to him that this and not next year was the most suitable time. ["Hear, hear!"] He quite admitted that if the shipping trade was included certain Amendments would have to be carried out, but on his side of the House no undue delay would arise on those Amendments, and if the Government were prepared to accept this proposal he could assure right hon. Gentlemen opposite that those on his side of the House would accept the necessary Amendments with the greatest possible alacrity. He would suggest to his hon. Friend the Member for Hull that he should allow the Committee to have a clear issue and a clear vote on this matter. ["Hear, hear!"] His hon. Friend proposed that this proposal should only apply to ships in any port or harbour in the United Kingdm. He understood that his hon. Friend himself was in favour of the application of the Bill to sailors generally, and he would appeal to him not to press his Amendment so that the Committee might have a clean vote with regard to the inclusion of sailors. They could afterwards discuss how far the Factory Act of 1895 or this Bill ought to apply to ships in dock or in mid-stream. He could only express his regret that the Government had not seen their way to accept an Amendment which had been pressed on them by the most representative of the employers as well as by those who represented the men themselves. ["Hear, hear!"]

*SIR THOMAS SUTHERLAND (Greenock) wished to say a few words from the ship owners' point of view. With regard to the application of the existing law to accidents which happened on ships in port, whether discharging on to the quay or into lighters alongside, he believed that if an accident arose from some blunder committed on board the ship, the injured man could bring an action against the owner; and such actions had often been successful. But that was, perhaps, a not very material point with regard to the question now before the Committee. In this matter he stood simply on the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1886 on the Employers' Liability Act of which he had the honour to be a member. The whole of this question was thoroughly investigated, and as far as he recollected the members of the Committee agreed to a recommendation, without a dissentient voice, that shipping should not be included in the operation of the new Act except to the extent of making owners responsible when their ships are in port and under their control. That was a recomendation he was sure every ship owner would readily endorse. The hon. Member for Hull was under a slight misapprehension as to the accidents occurring to seamen as seamen. There were comparatively few seamen on board ship in port, and the accidents which occurred there were to stevedores, dockers, and labourers, who had full opportunity of bringing an action. Conditions applicable to great steamship companies were not, and ought not to be, any criterion of the conditions which would apply to owners of sailing vessels, and especially coasting vessels. Although in magnitude of tonnage and the distances they travelled steam vessels outnumbered sailing vessels by 50 to 1, the loss of life in sailing vessels was fully half the total loss of life in the mercantile marine. So if the Amendment were brought into operation and ships of all kinds were put under it, it would be one more nail in the coffin of the sailing ship and coasting vessel interest, and our supply of British seamen would be hindered by the loss of coasting vessels more than by anything else. Therefore this was not a question for rich companies such as the hon. Member for Southampton represented, or for poor companies such as he himself represented. [*Laughter.*] We had better follow the example of the Germans one step further and leave alone what they had left alone—compulsory insurance on the part of German shipping. There was no one behind the scenes in connection with this subject who was not fully aware that one of the dangers of the future would be German competition. He did not pretend to be a philanthropist like the hon. Member for Southampton and others beside him. He stood on the evidence given before a Committee of the House, which evidence had never been superseded, to which the hon. Member for Middlesbrough contributed in a marked degree and in the fairest manner by absolving ship owners from any responsibility in cases where it was impossible for them to exercise any practical control.

SIR H. S. KING said he recognised the extreme difficulties of bringing this matter to a practical issue, but after the discussion that had taken place he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR FRANCIS EVANS commented on the careless manner in which the opponents of the Bill had arrayed their forces against it. His hon. Friend the Member for Greenock, relying upon some calculations made 11 years ago in connection with a Bill which, of course, was not before the House, said that he was not prepared to change his opinion now. The hon. Member, in fact, said, "I won't play." That was a nice way of disposing of a question which concerned the interests of the seamen of our mercantile marine. The right hon. Member for the Ormskirk Division had spoken in favour of his Amendment, but said that a special Bill was to be brought in and that, therefore, the Amendment need not be pressed. The right hon. Gentleman "would not play." Next came the hon. and gallant Member for South Bristol, who said that the Amendment was reasonable, but who also, like the right hon. Member for Ormskirk, "would not play." The same attitude had been taken up by other Members. Where then was he to look for support on behalf of men who, hon. Members knew in their hearts, ought to have the benefit of the Bill? Hon. Members expressed themselves in favour of his proposal, and yet would not vote for it. The way in which his Amendment had been met did not reflect great credit upon the ship owners and their representatives. [Sir A. Forwood: "I never said I would not vote for the Amendment!"] He hoped that he might understand from that that the right hon. Baronet was going to vote for the Amendment. As he had previously said, the difference as regards insurance between liners and other vessels was the difference between 6d. and 1s. That was proved by their 20 years' experience of insurance in Protection clubs.

*Mr. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said nothing had shown the rapid advance of public opinion in England more than the reception, he might say the welcome, which the proposals involved in this Measure, rightly called a revolutionary Measure, had received at the hands of employers of labour. That this should be so was to the infinite credit of employers. When one set of employers—ship owners—were definitely opposed to the Measure so far as their trade was concerned, it was not unreasonable to suppose that there were at all events some reasonable grounds upon which their views were based. In Liverpool the Steam Ship Owners' Association had expressed total disapproval of the inclusion of the shipping industry within the scope of the Bill, and so had the Sailing Ship Owners' Association. So also had the Shipowners' Parliamentary Committee, representing nine-tenths of the ship owning interest of this country. He believed that the hon. Member for Southampton and the right hon. Member for the Ormskirk Division of Lancashire were probably the only two ship owners who would support the inclusion of ships in this particular Bill. He pointed out the fundamental difference which existed between the risk in land and sea employment. In truth, there was very little in common between the two employments. In the one the trade was regulated by a code of shipping involving no less than 748 sections, to which two more sections had been added this Session. This code provided for the health and accommodation of seamen, and for their expenses during illness. But wholly apart from considerations of this kind, the conditions of the employment of seamen were totally distinct from the conditions of the employment of men ashore. It was impossible for a ship owner to select the men he employed in the same way as an employer on land; when once the men were shipped, and the ship gone to sea, the ship was beyond the control of the ship owner until she arrived at the next port. Then the risks and the consequences of accident were different. The two things could not be compared; there was no analogy between them. The law, not only in England, but abroad, recognised the difference which existed. On these and many other grounds he held that there was no ground for the inclusion of shipping in this Bill. He did not wish to say that there was not room for the improvement of the law as far as seamen were concerned, but they ought to be dealt with separately. He pointed out that the burden of insurance was especially heavy on ship owners, and if the proposed liability were added to their other liabilities, the burden on this industry would be out of all proportion to that on trades ashore.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) said he was very unwilling to press the Committee in regard to this Bill, but he had abstained from moving the abolition of the Twelve o'clock Rule because he was told that it would force Debate and be rather inconvenient to the majority of Members. He did not desire to curtail the Debate, and he recognised the great importance of the subject they were discussing, but he thought it would be to the general convenience if, when an argument had been thoroughly developed on both sides of the House, a decision were come to. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON said the seamen's case was a very hard one, and he must ask the indulgence of Members on that occasion. He would point out, in answer to the hon. Member for Greenock, with reference to the Committee of Inquiry, that at the time it was held the seamen were practically unorganised; they had no unions, while the ship owners had a very strong organisation, and were strongly represented on the Committee. He believed that he was the only seaman who gave evidence before that Committee; the other witnesses were shipowners; and naturally the weight of evidence was on the ship owners' side. The hon. Member for Kilmarnock Burghs had argued that it was a hardship on the ship owner if a captain died, and another captain was appointed abroad, but it would be equally hard on the seamen, who would have no voice whatever in regard to the second captain. They had not had one solid argument against seamen being included in this Bill, and the arguments which had been brought forward might be applied with equal force to the case of the mine owners. He appealed to hon. Members on behalf of the widows and orphans left in our seaport towns to include seamen in this Bill.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said he would like to say a few words on behalf of the small owners. If the Amendment were included, he understood that every fishing smack all round the coast would be included. He pointed out that in his constituency men of energy and endurance who saved money invested their savings in buying a smack. They thus became owners, and as the vessel represented all the property they possessed, not only was the best possible care taken of the vessels, but there was the strongest inducement on their part to prevent the loss of life as well as the occurrence of accident. If the Amendment was adopted, however, the Committee would extinguish the small owners of fishing and coasting vessels, while prospects of compensation would be fictitious in case of loss, for all the owners' property might be at the bottom of the sea.

MR. BURNS desired to appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury to release his supporters from Party allegiance in recording their votes on the inclusion or exclusion of seamen. If the right hon. Gentleman gave this permission, he was convinced, after the arguments which had been brought forward, that seamen would be included in the Bill. The Colonial Secretary and the Home Secretary had resisted the extension of the Bill on the ground that, if it were extended, the Measure might be defeated and ultimately abandoned. There was no fear of this result as to the inclusion of seamen, because eloquent and powerful speeches had been delivered in favour of the seamen being included from the largest and best ship owners on both sides of the House. He trusted that the Committee would not be influenced by the speech and the unintentional misstatements of the hon. Member for Greenock, who was apprehensive as to the effect of the Bill on English ships competing with foreign ships. The Government had supplied hon. Members with a return as to the liability of ship owners in foreign countries, and our chief competitors, Sweden and Norway, France, Denmark, and Germany, already incurred the cost of employers' liability. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to allow the lion and the lamb to associate together in dealing with this Amendment in the Division Lobby. [*Laughter.*]

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I do not know which is the lion and which is the lamb—[*laughter*]—nor have I any power to dictate into which Lobby either the lion or the lamb shall go. But I cannot recede, even in response to the sympathetic appeal of the hon. Gentleman, from the attitude taken up by my colleagues on this Bench—that in the opinion of the Government it would be in the highest degree inexpedient to overload this Bill at this time, or possibly this Bill at any time, with clauses which would introduce seamen within its purview. That the case of seamen has to be dealt with we all admit—[*Opposition cheers*]—whether it shall be by a simple extension of this Bill or by a separate Bill remains for future consideration. But at this moment, and in the Committee stage of this Bill, I must emphatically repeat that we do not think it would be desirable in the interests of this Bill that the Amendment should be accepted. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give a pledge to bring in a Bill this year to extend the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 to seamen, or, failing that, next year?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I am very reluctant to mortgage a property over which I have no control —that is, the time of the House—in regard to future legislation. We are already rather deeply pledged in regard to that.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON suggested that a very short Bill of two or three words was all that would be required.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: I think I must ask hon. Gentlemen to be content with the emphatic assurances given them by my right hon. Friends the Home Secretary and the Colonial Secretary and by myself. [*Cheers.*]

Question put, "That the word 'ship' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 117; Noes, 209.—(Division List, No. 227.)

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved in Sub-section (1) after the word "quarry," to insert the word "lift," in order to extend the benefits of the Bill to persons in charge of lifts.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said that as lifts in private houses were worked by domestic servants, the adoption of the Amendment would lead to complications; and as, besides, it only affected a very small class, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press it.

MR. McKENNA said there were very few lifts even in private houes worked by domestic servants. The lifts to which the Amendment would mainly apply were lifts in hotels and other large buildings.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. CHARLES HARRISON (Plymouth) moved, in Sub-section (1), after the word "quarry," to insert the word "tramway," in order to include tramways within the operation of the Bill. As it was probable that in a short time all tramways would be worked by mechanical power, there was no reason why they should be excluded while railways were included in the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said it was clear this Amendment could not be inserted here, but possibly it might save discussion if he said that the Government proposed to take the definition in the Regulation of Railways Act 1873, not that in the Act of 1871. Certainly they would take care that the words of the Bill were sufficiently wide to include tramways connected with mines and light railways. They did not, however, intend to include the ordinary street tramways.

CAPTAIN NORTON pointed out that the difference between a tramway and a light railway was not so great as the Attorney General supposed, and that if tramway men were included in the Bill the inclusion would be very small—according to the last census about 7,000. As compared with railway workers, who numbered 200,000, the responsibility cast upon tramway men was very great. The tramways carried something like 600,000,000 passengers per year, while the railways did not carry more than 900,000,000, excluding season-ticket holders. Therefore, each tramway employé was responsible for a much larger number of passengers in proportion—for 15 times as many, in fact—as the railway man. He frequently used the tramways in his constituency—[*ironical cheers*]—and he really believed that the driver of a tramcar had a much greater responsibility cast upon him than the driver of a mail train. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] He appealed to the Government to extend the benefits of the Bill to the 7,000 tramway men.

Question put, "That the word 'tramway' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 99; Noes, 195.—(Division List, No. 228.)

MR. BROADHURST moved in Sub-section (1), after the word "employment," to insert the words:—

> "in any place where material is being prepared for building work, or where any building is in course of construction."

It would be seen that his object in moving this Amendment had special reference to the building trade. His intention was to meet the case of stone-yards mostly. All up the Thames riverside there were large wharves where stone was landed from ships, and prepared by masons, to be carted to all parts of London for use in the erection of buildings. Scarcely any of these wharves had any machinery except hand jennies and hand travellers. There were a great number of men employed, but there was no machinery to include them in the Bill, and he thought it would harmonise with the intention of the Government if these works were included. The same argument would apply in a large measure to the joinery and carpentry trades, in which large timber roofs were often prepared at a considerable distance from the site where they were to be used in building. They had had considerable discussion at several stages with regard to the inclusion of the building trade, and he did not propose to continue his argument any further that night than to ask the Government whether they had considered the case of these stone wharves, and places connected with the joinery trade? If not, there could be no doubt that a large number of men whom it was intended to benefit would be excluded under the definition of the Bill unless some such words as he had moved were accepted.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said he was afraid the words moved by the hon. Gentleman opposite were rather too wide. The Government had been considering the question of extending the operation of the Bill further in regard to the building trade, and he proposed to accept the words of the Amendment placed on the Paper by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean with any addition that might be required. The right hon. Gentleman then read the terms of his Amendment as follows: After the words "engineering work," to insert the words:—

"and to employment on, in, or about any building exceeding thirty feet in height which is being constructed or repaired by means of a scaffolding, or on which machinery driven by steam, water, or other mechanical power is being used for the purpose of the construction or repair thereof."

MR. BROADHURST thought that this was a very considerable concession, and though it did not give him all he wanted, he should accept it.

*SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I will put it on the Paper to-morrow.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. J. A. PEASE moved, in Subsection (1), after the words "about a," to insert the word "shipyard." He understood it was the intention of the Government that shipyards should be included within the provisions of the Bill; and he, therefore, in moving the Amendment, moved it in order to point out how the intention would not be carried into effect, unless some additional words were inserted. The 93rd Clause of the Act of 1878 indicated that those industries named in the second part of Schedule 4 of the Bill were "workshops," but he was advised that a shipyard would be included in the word "factory" so long as the work was done within the precincts of a yard where steam, water, or mechanical power was used to drive machinery. But a good deal of rivetting might be done outside a factory or workshop, such, as for instance, in the erection of a gasometer, or repairing ships outside a shipyard. He thought the Government ought to let them understand what was intended to be included in the Bill. He would give one or two cases. If a ship was in mid-stream, would the men at work upon her be included in the provisions of the Bill? He thought not, and he contended that there should be provisions introduced to meet that case.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS called attention to the fact that the Amendment was "shipyards," not ships in mid-stream.

*MR. J. A. PEASE submitted that as the word "shipbuilding yard" in the Act of 1878 included other work, he was in order in raising this question. It was perfectly absurd that any distinction should be made between men, all in the same employ, at work in the yard or in the dock, and those at work on repairs on a ship in mid-stream—the one to be compensated and the other not. They should all be included, for all the conditions of labour were very dangerous, and shipyard accidents were 16 times more numerous than those on railways.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said this matter was already dealt with in the Bill, and he could not accept the Amendment, which was not necessary.

MR. ABEL THOMAS rose and proceeded to speak on the Amendment, when,

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITEHALL) SITE (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

PATENT OFFICE EXTENSION (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (UNDERMANNING) BILL.

Read the Third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE (SITES) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

SUPPLY [28TH MAY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1897-8.

CLASS I.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £132,291, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the Survey of the United Kingdom, and for minor services connected therewith."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £24,037 (including an additional sum of £11,950), be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the maintaining certain Harbours, Lighthouses, &c., under the Board of Trade."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for constructing a new Harbour of Refuge at Peterhead."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £189,367, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for rates and contributions in lieu of rates, &c., in respect of Government property, and for rates on houses occupied by representatives of Foreign Powers, and for the salaries and expenses of the rating of Government property Department, and for a contribution towards the expenses of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade."

CLASS II.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £19,576, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses in the Offices of the House of Commons."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £132,859, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £29,215, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for a grant in aid of the Mercantile Marine Fund."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £8, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for meeting the deficiency of income from fees, &c., for the requirements of the Board of Trade, under the Bankruptcy Acts 1883 and 1890, and the 'Companies (Winding-up) Act 1890.'"

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £34,291, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1898, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Agriculture, and to defray the repayable expenses to be incurred in matters of Inclosure and Land Improvements, and to pay certain grants in aid."

Resolutions Read a Second time.

First five Resolutions agreed to.

Sixth Resolution postponed.

Subsequent Resolutions agreed to.

Postponed Resolution to be considered upon Monday 21st June.

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES BILL.

Read a Second time, and committed for Thursday.

LAW OF EVIDENCE (CRIMINAL CASES) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

LAND TRANSFER BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

EXTRAORDINARY TITHE BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

BERRIEW SCHOOOL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Third Reading [24th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

PRISONS BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

POLICE (PROPERTY) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Committee deferred till Monday 28th June.

POOR LAW BILL.

Second Reading deferred till to-morrow.

FINANCE BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, etc., [17th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

SCHOOL BOARDS' EXPENSES BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

BICYCLES (IRELAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st April] further adjourned till Thursday.

BURIAL GROUNDS LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [11th May] further adjourned till Thursday.

ISLE OF MAN (CHURCH BUILDING ACTS) BILL [H.L.].

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

SUPPLY.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Committee deferred till Wednesday.

SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

SALMON FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

RESTRAINT OF EVICTIONS (LONDON) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1. Committee report progress; to sit again upon Thursday.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) (COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for Committal to Select Committee [24th March] further adjourned till Wednesday.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday 17th June.

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Motion for committal to Standing Committee on Trade, Etc. [17th February] further adjourned till To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

VEHICLES (LIGHTS) BILL.

Committee deferred till Thursday.

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON (ADDITIONAL ENDOWMENTS) BILL.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [24th February] further adjourned till To-morrow.

COTTON CLOTH AND OTHER FACTORIES BILL.

Read a Second time and committed for Friday 20th August.

POLICE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday.

LABOUR BUREAUX BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LICENSING EXEMPTION (HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT) BILL.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

LONDON WATER COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL.

Second Reading deferred till Monday 28th June.

VERMINOUS PERSONS BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the Third time To-morrow.

House adjourned at a Quarter after Twelve o'Clock.

INDEX

TO

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION).

VOLUME XLIX. FOURTH SERIES.

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1897.

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills Read 1ª, 1°, 2ª, 2°, 3ª, 3°. Read the First, Second, or Third Time.
1R., 2R., 3R. Speech delivered on First, Second, or Third Reading.
Adj. Adjourned.
A. Answer.
c. Commons.
Com. Committee.
com. Committed.
Intro. Introduction.
l. Lords.
Obj. Objections.
Obs. Observations.
Pres. Presented.
Q. Question.
Rep. Reported.
R.P. Report Progress.
Reso. Resolutions.

The Subjects of Debate, as far as possible, are classified under General Headings, e.g. :—

AFRICA
AGRICULTURE, BOARD OF
ARMY
CIVIL SERVICE
COLONIES
CUSTOMS, EXCISE, AND INLAND REVENUE
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FOREIGN OFFICE
HOME DEPARTMENT
INDIA
IRELAND
LABOUR QUESTIONS
LAW AND JUSTICE AND POLICE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD
MERCHANT SHIPPING
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
METROPOLIS
NAVY
PARLIAMENT
POST OFFICE
RAILWAYS
SCOTLAND
SUPPLY
TRADE, BOARD OF
WALES
WAYS AND MEANS

ABRAHAM, MR. WILLIAM, *Glamorgan, Rhondda*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1285

Accidents
Colliery, Polesworth, Q. Sir B. W. Foster ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1255
Lead Poisoning, Q. Mr. R. McKenna ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1134
Mining, Durham, Q. Mr. C. Fenwick : *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 7, 18
Romford Railway Station, Fatal, Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 113
Seamen, Mercantile Marine, Q. Mr. J. Havelock Wilson ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 731
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill (see that Title)

ACLAND, Right Hon. A. H. DYKE, *Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 123, 126, 151, 152 ; 3R. *May* 20, 950
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 27, 1463

ACLAND-HOOD, Captain Sir A. F., Bart., *Somerset, Wellington*
Army, Small Arms Ammunition *May* 13, 360
Brigade of Guards *May* 13, 362, 363
Supply : War Office Vote *May* 14, 512

ADMIRALTY
First Lord—Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN
Secretary—Mr. W. G. E. MACARTNEY
Civil Lord—Mr. J. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN
(See NAVY)

AFRICA

British East Africa Protectorate, Fugitive Slaves, Qs. Sir J. H. Kennaway, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516
Cape Garrison, Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 11, 200. *Qs.* Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Swift MacNeill; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 492. *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1260
Congo State, Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 11, 193; *May* 18, 720
Delagoa Bay, Arbitration Award, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1520
Fugitive Slaves
  British East Africa Protectorate, Qs. Sir J. H. Kennaway, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516
  Zanzibar, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1025
Jameson Raid, Transvaal, Q. Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 8
Kassala, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 20, 915
Liquor Traffic, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 31, 1608
Mashonaland, Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. J. Morley; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1626
Matabeleland and Mashonaland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 385
Red Sea, Lighting, Q. Sir E. S. Hill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 99
Royal Niger Company, Q. Lord Stanmore; [*Obs.* Earl of Kimberley;] *A.* Marquess of Salisbury *May* 24, 1109
Slavery in Zanzibar, Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 14, 506
Transvaal
  Immigration Law, Q. Mr. Sydney Buxton; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 17
  Jameson Raid, Q. Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 8
Uganda Railway, Q. Mr. R. W. Perks; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 27, 1430
Zanzibar
  British Officers, Appointment of, Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516
  Fugitive Slaves, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1025
  Slavery in, Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 14, 506

Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill

c. Withdrawn *May* 24, 1213

AGRICULTURE, BOARD OF

President—Mr. Walter H. Long

Agricultural Holdings Act, Qs. Mr. G. Lambert; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 24, 1148
Agricultural Rating Act (Ireland), Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. T. Lough; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1024. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1142

[*cont*

AGRICULTURE, BOARD OF—cont.

Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 501
Cattle
  American, Qs. Mr. D. Macaleese, Mr. G. W. Wolff; *As.* Mr. W. Long *May* 28, 1511
  Food, Imported, Q. Mr. C. T. Giles; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 31, 1631
  Trade, Argentine, Q. Sir J. Kinloch; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1131
  Weighing, Scotland, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 13, 367
Dog Muzzling, Q. Mr. J. W. Logan; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 20, 931
Estates
  Annaly, Longford, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1507
  Kerry, Receivers, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1024
  Littledale (Wicklow), Eviction, Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613
  Return, Ireland, Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 384
  Shirley and Tennison (Monaghan), Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
Glebe Act (Ireland), Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1146
Land
  Commission, Ireland, Qs. Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 12. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. C. Flynn, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 620. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 925. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Captain Donelan, Mr. J. Gilhooly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1603
  Commissioners, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 364
  Legislation, Ireland (see that Title)
  Rating, Ireland, Qs. Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. T. Lough, Mr. Vesey Knox; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 936
  Sub-Commissions, Qs. Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. S. Young; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 363. *Q.* Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 509. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1265
  Valuation, Ireland, Qs. Viscount Clifden, Earl Spencer; *As.* Earl of Denbigh *May* 13, 338
Land Law (Ireland) Act 1887, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1265
Land Law (Ireland) Acts, Q. Viscount Templetown; [*Obs.* Earl of Mayo;] *A.* Earl of Denbigh *May* 20, 896
Land Law (Ireland) Acts, Royal Commission, Qs. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 24, 1148
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill (see that Title)
Ordnance Survey, Mayo, Q. Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 389. *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 17, 626

[*cont.*

AGRICULTURE, BOARD OF—cont.
  Potato Crops
    Ireland, *Qs.* Mr. P. McDermott, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
    Listowel, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1512
  Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Act 1895, *Qs.* Mr. J. Hammond; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 503
  Shorthorn Bulls, Ireland, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1146
  Veterinary College, Dublin, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 386
  Weighing of Cattle, Scotland, *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 13, 367

AIRD, Mr. JOHN, *Paddington, N.*
  Paris Fire, Safety of Public Buildings *May* 10, 95, 96
  Queen's Reign
    Jubilee Procession *May* 28, 1507
    Metropolitan Police *May* 21, 1029
    Naval Review *May* 28, 1508
    Public Statues *May* 21, 1029

AKERS-DOUGLAS, RIGHT HON. A. (First Commissioner of Works, Parks, and Public Buildings), *Kent, St. Augustine*
  Government Offices, Site *May* 14, 495
  Hyde Park
    Cycling in *May* 10, 94
    Footpaths *May* 24, 1131
  Magnetic Observatory, Greenwich *May* 28, 1520
  Queen's Reign
    Cycle Demonstration *May* 20, 914
    Illuminations *May* 18, 725
    Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9; *May* 10, 94; *May* 14, 495; *May* 20, 913, 914; *May* 24, 1127; *May* 25, 1262; *May* 28, 1507; *May* 31, 1615
    Public Statues *May* 21, 1029
    Route of Procession *May* 13, 376
  South Kensington Museum *May* 31, 1614
  Westminster Hall *May* 14, 506

ALLAN, Mr. W., *Gateshead*
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 443
  War Risks, British Ships *May* 11, 199

AMBROSE, Dr. R., *Mayo, W.*
  Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District, Castlebar Union *May* 24, 1146
  Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1089

AMBROSE, MR. W. (Attorney General for the Duchy of Lancaster), *Middlesex, Harrow*
  Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expense *May* 11, 246
  Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 227

America
  Argentine Cattle Trade, *Q.* Sir J. Kinloch; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1131
  British Zukon Chartered Company, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1631
  Canadian
    Fast Atlantic Service, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 25, 1267
    Mail Service, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1619.
  Cattle, *Qs.* Mr. D. Macaleese, Mr. G. W. Wolff; *As.* Mr. W. Long *May* 28, 1511
  Dingley Tariff Bill (United States), *Q.* Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1268
  Manitoba
    Colonisation Board, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 25, 1261
    Crofters' Settlements, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 18, 730

ANCASTER, EARL OF (Lord Great Chamberlain)
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 2

ANSTRUTHER, MR. H. T. (Lord of the Treasury), *St. Andrews District*
  Manitoba
    Colonisation Board *May* 25, 1261
    Crofters' Settlement *May* 18, 730
  Port Ness Harbour, Lewis *May* 11, 197
  Queen's Reign, Poor Laws *May* 28, 1509

Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill
  c. In Com., Mr. M. Healy, (*Amendt.*) 235, 236; Mr. J. Atkinson, 235, 236; (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 235); [Chairman, 236, 237] *May* 11
    Rep. as Amended *May* 11, 237
    Considered as Amended *May* 13, 449
    Read 3^{o} and Passed *May* 17, 713
  l. Read 1^{a} *May* 18, 718
    Read 2^{a} and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 21, 1017
    In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 24, 1114
    Read 3^{a} and Passed *May* 25, 1241

Archdeaconry of Cornwall Bill
  l. Read 2^{a} and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 7, 1
    In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 13, 327
    Read 3^{a} and Passed *May* 14, 466

Armenia
  Massacre, Tokat, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1036; *May* 25, 1257

ARMY

Secretary of State—Marquess of LANSDOWNE
Under Secretary of State—Mr. BRODRICK
Financial Secretary—Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS

- *Aldershot Camp, Sewage Farm, Q.* Sir B. W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 11, 196
- *Ammunition, Small Arms, Q.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 360
- *Artillery*
  - *Practice, Solent, Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 10, 110
  - *Royal Horse, Q.* Mr. A. M. Brookfield; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1607
- *Battalions Abroad, Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1254
- *Black Watch Regiment, Subathu, Q.* Colonel Wyndham Murray; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 25, 1251
- *Brigade of Guards*
  - *Medical Department, Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 17, 617
  - *Recruits, Qs.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 362
- *Cape Garrison, Q.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 11, 200. *Qs.* Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Swift MacNeill; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 492. *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1260
- *Cavalry*
  - *Recruiting Standard, Q.* General Russell; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1417
  - *Recruits, Q.* Mr. J. H. C. Hozier; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1132
- *Chitral Medal, Q.* Mr. T. R. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 17, 629
- *Crimean Veterans*
  - *Brennan (John), Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1632
  - *Indian and, Queen's Reign, Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413
  - *Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 28, 1510
- *Food and Forage Supplies, Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1625
- *Garrison, Cape, Q.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 11, 200. *Qs.* Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Swift MacNeill; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 492. *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1260
- *Guards, Brigade of*
  - *Medical Department, Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 17, 617
  - *Recruits, Qs.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 362
- *Horses, Qs.* Mr. J. F. Hogan, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 10, 104. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 364
- *Hospitals, Lock, Qs.* Mr. A. F. Jeffreys; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 18, 719
- *Indian Staff*
  - *Appointments, Q.* Captain Pirie; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 27, 1428
  - *Corps, Q.* Sir H. S. King; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 27, 1421

[*cont.*

ARMY—cont.

- *Indian Staff*—cont.
  - *Officers, Qs.* Colonel Wyndham Murray, Captain Pirie; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1619
- *Judge Advocate General's Department, Qs.* Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. J. W. Mellor; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1635
- *Linked Battalion System, Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 10, 96
- *Lock Hospitals, Qs.* Mr. A. F. Jeffreys; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 18, 719
- *Matabeleland and Mashonaland, Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 385
- *Military Manœuvres Bill, Q.* General Russell; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 937
- *Military Prisons, Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. L. R. Holland; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1620
- *Militia Officers*
  - *Field, Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1132
  - *Vacancies, Q.* Mr. G. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1259
- *Officers*
  - *Army, Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 7, 9
  - *Militia*
    - *Field, Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1132
    - *Vacancies, Q.* Mr. G. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1259
  - *Staff, India, Qs.* Colonel Wyndham Murray, Captain Pirie; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1619
- *Prisons, Military, Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. L. R. Holland; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1620
- *Queen's Reign*
  - *East End Procession, Q.* Mr. Wootton-Isaacson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 375. *Q.* Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1616
  - *Crimean and Indian Veterans, Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413
  - *Crimean Veterans, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 28, 1510
  - *Officers of Army, Q.* Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 7, 9
  - *Seats for Indian Services, Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1615
  - *Volunteers, Review of, Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1126
- *Recruiting Standard, Cavalry, Q.* General Russell; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1417
- *Recruits*
  - *Brigade of Guards, Qs.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 362
  - *Cavalry, Q.* Mr. J. H. C. Hozier; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1132
- *Regulations, St. Patrick's Day, Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill, Captain Donelan; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 10, 100. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 28, 1521
- *Remounts, Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 18, 729. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 25, 1270

[*cont.*

ARMY—cont.
- *Reserve*, *Q.* Captain Grice-Hutchinson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1258
- *Royal*
  - *Corps of Army Surgeons*, *Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 18, 722
  - *Horse Artillery*, *Q.* Mr. A. M. Brookfield; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1607
  - *Patriotic Fund*
    - *Compassionate Allowance*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 11, 195
    - *Officers' Widows*, *Q.* Mr. A. M. Brookfield; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 511
    - *Supplemental Commission*, *Q.* Mr. H. E. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 376
- *Scots Greys*, *Qs.* Mr. J. H. C. Hozier; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 7, 5
- *Service Record: Deniston (Joseph)*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1408
- *Small Arms Ammunition*, *Q.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 360
- *Staff*
  - *Appointments, India*, *Q.* Captain Pirie; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 27, 1428
  - *Officers, India*, *Qs.* Colonel Wyndham Murray, Captain Pirie; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1619
- *Surgeons, Royal Corps*, *Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 18, 722
- *Troops, Colonial and Indian, at East End, Queen's Reign*, *Q.* Mr. Wootton-Isaacson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 375
- *Victoria Cross: Baxter (Trooper)*, *Q.* General Laurie; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 21, 1021
- *Volunteers Bill* (see that Title)
- *Volunteers, Review of, Queen's Reign*, *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1126
- *War Office Vote*, *Q.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 512
- *Wormwood Scrubbs*, *Q.* Mr. W. E. T. Sharpe; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 504

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O., *Belfast, W.*
- Cape Garrison *May* 14, 493, 494
- Mashonaland *May* 31, 1626
- Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 575, 577
- War Risks, National Insurance *May* 10, 118

Arran, Earl of
- Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1235

Ascroft, Mr. R., *Oldham*
- Queen's Reign, Decorations *May* 18, 725
- Telegrams, Oldham *May* 18, 727
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 259
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 676, 680, 681; In Com. *May* 25, 1299; *May* 26, 1392; *May* 27, 1442, 1443, 1444, 1462, 1467; *May* 31, 1639

ASHBOURNE, Lord (Lord Chancellor of Ireland)
- Juries Detention Bill *May* 28, 1503

Ashton, Mr. T. Gair, *Beds, Luton*
- Voluntary Schools Act *May* 10, 92
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 786

Asquith, Right Hon. H. H., *Fife, E.*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 747, 762, 813; *May* 24, 1164, 1167, 1170, In Com. 1199; *May* 25, 1289, 1299, 1305, 1309, 1341, 1342; *May* 26, 1351, 1363, 1382, 1386, 1389; *May* 27, 1438, 1454, 1458, 1480; *May* 31, 1662

Atherley-Jones, Mr. Llewellyn A., *Durham, N.W.*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 673; In Com. *May* 25, 1335, 1341; *May* 27, 1439, 1470

ATKINSON, Right Hon. JOHN (Attorney General for Ireland), *Londonderry, N.*
- Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill, In Com. *May* 11, 235, 236
- Brookeborough Petty Sessions *May* 10, 110; *May* 14, 497
- Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill *May* 10, 106
- Charges
  - Murder
    - Omagh *May* 20, 922
    - Tyrone *May* 18, 728
  - Robbery, Tyrone *May* 24, 1144
- Estates Return, Ireland *May* 13, 384
- Fishery Inquiry, Listowel *May* 31, 1633
- Irish Acts, Codification *May* 13, 385
- Jurors Challenged, Tyrone *May* 31, 1617
- Land Commissioners *May* 13, 364
- Larceny, Alleged, Tyrone *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269; *May* 27, 1422, 1423
- Letterbreen Petty Sessions *May* 20, 932
- Longford Canal Harbour *May* 18, 726; *May* 28, 1514
- River Feale Fishing *May* 24, 1130
- Rooskey Bridge, Roscommon *May* 24, 1140
- Supply: £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1103
- Tyrone
  - Charges
    - Murder *May* 18, 728; *May* 20, 922
    - Robbery *May* 24, 1144
  - Jurors Challenged *May* 31, 1617
  - Larceny, Alleged *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269; *May* 27, 1422, 1423
- Voters' List, Westmeath *May* 25, 1271; *May* 27, 1424

Austin, Mr. M., *Limerick, W.*
- Supply: £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1565

Australasia
- *Mails, India and, Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 730
- *New South Wales, Finance Act, Q.* Mr. R. Cox; Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 27, 1429
- *Queensland, Qs.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 10, 112; *May* 25, 1256

BADEN-POWELL, Sir GEORGE S., *Liverpool, Kirkdale*
- Artillery Practice, Solent *May* 10, 110
- Discharge of British Seamen Abroad *May* 27, 1406
- War Risks, National Insurance *May* 10, 118
- Wreck, *S.S. Memphis May* 7, 13

BAILEY, Mr. J., *Newington, Walworth*
- Newington Vestry Election *May* 27, 1419

BAILLIE, Mr. JAMES E. B., *Inverness*
- Congested Districts, Scotland *May* 7, 10

BAINBRIDGE, Mr. EMERSON, *Lincolnshire, Gainsborough*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 644, 703; *May* 18, 793; In Com. *May* 25, 1312, 1326; *May* 27, 1437, 1442; *May* 31, 1646

BALFOUR, LORD (Secretary for Scotland)
- Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 1R. *May* 13, 328, 337; 2R. *May* 20, 878, 887

BALFOUR, RIGHT HON. ARTHUR J. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Manchester, E.*
- Agricultural Holdings Act *May* 24, 1148
- Benefices Bill *May* 21, 1038, 1039
- British Museum *May* 31, 1636
- Business of the House
  - General *May* 10, 116, 117, 119, 120, 184; *May* 11, 203; *May* 13, 393, 394, 449; *May* 14, 580; *May* 17, 633, 634; *May* 24, 1148; *May* 25, 1272; *May* 28, 1523, 1524; *May* 31, 1637
  - Morning Sittings on Tuesday *May* 10, 120
  - Supply
    - Colonial Office Vote *May* 18, 733
    - War Office Vote *May* 14, 512
- Committees, Ascension Day *May* 26, 1345
- Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill *May* 20, 908; *May* 31, 1636
- Crewe, Representation *May* 17, 634, 635
- Drainage Works, Ireland *May* 27, 1431
- Duration of Speeches, House of Commons *May* 17, 632
- Education, Half-time Scholars *May* 10, 93
- Elementary
  - Education Act, Age Clause *May* 17, 632
  - Teachers' Pensions Fund *May* 10, 118
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 152
- Greece and the Powers *May* 11, 201
- Indian Budget *May* 25, 1271

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, Right Hon. ARTHUR J.—*cont.*
- Inebriates, Reformatories *May* 14, 510
- Judge Advocate General's Department *May* 31, 1635
- Judiciary, Ireland *May* 21, 1038
- Land
  - Law (Ireland) Acts, Royal Commission *May* 24, 1149
  - Rating, Ireland *May* 20, 936
- Lewis *May* 25, 1271
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1040, 1044, 1059; *May* 31, 1635
- Midwives Registration Act *May* 13, 390
- Military Manœuvres Bill *May* 20, 937
- Ordnance Survey, Mayo *May* 13, 390
- Poor Law Relief Ireland Bill *May* 14, 511
- Post Office Establishments *May* 11, 200
- Private Bill Legislation, Scotland *May* 13, 391
- Queen's Reign
  - Thanksgiving Service *May* 13, 375; *May* 25, 1263
  - Visit of Sultan's Son *May* 13, 376; *May* 14, 495
- Royal Patriotic Fund *May* 14, 511
- Sale of Foods and Drugs Act Amendment Bill *May* 13, 390; *May* 27, 1431
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 289, 292
- South Kensington Museum *May* 13, 392; *May* 28, 1522
- Supply
  - £61,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 537, 540, 553
  - £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1105
- Teachers' Superannuation Bill *May* 27, 1431
- Turco-Greek War *May* 10, 119; *May* 13, 393
- University of London Bill *May* 17, 632
- Wallace Bequest, Manchester House *May* 13, 391, 392
- War Risks
  - British Ships *May* 11, 199
  - National Insurance *May* 10, 118
- Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 937, 938; *May* 28, 1592
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 17, 624; *May* 20, 932, 933; In Com. *May* 26, 1372; *May* 31, 1698, 1700, 1701

BALFOUR, RIGHT HON. GERALD W. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Leeds, Central*
- Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District, Castlebar Union *May* 24, 1146
- Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill *May* 14, 502
- Agricultural Rating Act, Ireland *May* 21, 1024
- Annaly Estate, Longford *May* 28, 1507
- Ardagh Burial Ground *May* 11, 198
- Ard West Pier, Carna, Connemara *May* 10, 99
- Balbriggan Harbour *May* 13, 388
- Ballybunion (Kerry)
  - Bonâ-fide Travellers *May* 11, 197
  - Cashen River
    - Overflowing *May* 13, 377
    - Salmon Fishing *May* 25, 1257

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, Right Hon. GERALD W.—*cont.*

- Bankruptcy Court, Ireland *May* 21, 1034
- Bonâ-fide Travellers, Ballybunion (Kerry) *May* 11, 197
- Canals, Ireland *May* 18, 723
- Carrickfergus, High Sheriff *May* 14, 504
- Cashen River, Ballybunion
  - Overflowing *May* 13, 377
  - Salmon Fishing *May* 25, 1257
- Castleblaney
  - Land Commission, Sligo and *May* 7, 12
  - Petty Sessions *May* 27, 1427
- Cavan
  - Distress Relief Works *May* 28, 1518
  - Royal Irish Constabulary, Tullyvin *May* 11, 195
- Collection of Rates, Dublin *May* 10, 114
- Cork and Tralee Prisons *May* 14, 498
- Deportation of Paupers *May* 13, 374
- Distress Relief Works, Cavan *May* 28, 1518
- Dublin
  - Collection of Rates *May* 10, 114
  - Royal College of Science *May* 21, 1023; *May* 24, 1146
  - Veterinary College *May* 13, 386
- Education
  - Centre Superintendents, Ireland *May* 20, 913
  - Technical *May* 21, 1023
- Estates
  - Annaly, Longford *May* 28, 1507
  - Fermanagh School *May* 31, 1622
  - Kerry, Receivers *May* 21, 1025
  - Littledale, Wicklow *May* 11, 193; *May* 31, 1614
  - Shirley and Tennison, Monaghan *May* 24, 1147
- Evictions
  - Durnascallon (Derry) *May* 20, 915
  - Littledale Estate, Wicklow *May* 11, 193
  - Longford *May* 7, 4
- Fermanagh School Estate *May* 31, 1622
- Franchise Acts 1885 *May* 25, 1261
- Granard
  - Police Arrangements *May* 10, 98
  - Union *May* 31, 1628
- Grand Jury
  - Accounts, Monaghan *May* 24, 1147
  - Kerry *May* 21, 1027
  - System *May* 18, 723
- Gun and Game Licences, Ireland *May* 31, 1630
- High Sheriff, Carrickfergus *May* 14, 504
- Industrial Schools *May* 25, 1259
- Irish
  - Fisheries *May* 27, 1413, 1414
  - Schools, Epidemic Disease *May* 24, 1135
- Kerry
  - Ballybunion (see above)
  - Estates, Receivers *May* 21, 1025
  - Grand Jury *May* 21, 1027
  - Police Force *May* 27, 1414
  - Piers.
    - Salleen *May* 27, 1426
    - Sneem *May* 31, 1629
- Labourers' Cottages
  - Ireland *May* 17, 623; *May* 20, 918, 919
  - Meath *May* 10, 114
  - Strabane *May* 31, 1623
- Labourers (Ireland) Acts *May* 27, 1408

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, Right Hon. GERALD W.—*cont.*

- Land
  - Commission
    - Carrickmacross and Ballybay *May* 11, 192
    - Castleblaney and Sligo *May* 7, 12
    - Ireland *May* 17, 620, 621, 622; *May* 20, 926; *May* 31, 1603, 1604
  - Sub-Commissions *May* 13, 363, 364; *May* 14, 510; *May* 17, 620; *May* 25, 1265
- Land Law (Ireland) Act 1887 *May* 25, 1265
- Letterbreen Petty Sessions *May* 17, 618; *May* 18, 733
- Licences
  - Gun and Game, Ireland *May* 31, 1630
  - Publicans', Ireland *May* 20, 924
- Light Railways, Ireland *May* 24, 1136; *May* 25, 1264
- Limerick, Petty Sessions Fees *May* 31, 1630
- Listowel
  - Ormathwaite Property *May* 14, 499
  - Potato Crop *May* 28, 1512
- Littledale Estate, Wicklow *May* 11, 193; *May* 31, 1614
- Loan Fund
  - Board, Ireland *May* 28, 1518
  - Societies, Ireland *May* 10, 108, 109
- Local Government
  - Board Auditors, Ireland *May* 27, 1416
  - Ireland *May* 21, 1049
- Londonderry Lunatic Asylum *May* 24, 1138
- Longford
  - Annaly Estate *May* 28, 1507
  - Ardagh Burial Ground *May* 11, 198
  - Eviction *May* 7, 4
  - Union Workhouse *May* 27, 1409
- Lough Mask and Ballinrobe Canal *May* 14 494
- Macroom Guardians, Removal of Sick Paupers *May* 20, 917
- Maryborough Gaol: Prisoner Thomas Collins *May* 10, 109; *May* 21, 1025; *May* 27, 1413
- Mersey Docks Bill *May* 27, 1423
- Model Schools, Ireland
  - Inquiry *May* 7, 3
  - Queen's Birthday *May* 20, 915
- Mohill Burial Ground, Leitrim *May* 20, 929
- Monaghan
  - Grand Jury Accounts *May* 24, 1147
  - Newbliss Petty Sessions Courthouse *May* 24, 1136
  - Shirley and Tennison Estates *May* 24, 1147
- Mullingar Union *May* 21, 1031; *May* 27, 1425; *May* 28, 1518
- National School
  - Monitors, Ireland *May* 27, 1405
  - Teachers' Fund, Ireland *May* 17, 619
  - Workmistresses *May* 24, 1137
- Newbliss Petty Sessions Courthouse, Monaghan *May* 24, 1136
- Ormathwaite Property, Listowel *May* 14, 499
- Paupers
  - Deportation of *May* 13, 374
  - Removal of Sick, Macroom Guardians *May* 20, 917
- Petty Sessions
  - Castleblaney *May* 27, 1427
  - Courthouse, Newbliss (Monaghan) *May* 24, 1136
  - Fees, Limerick *May* 31, 1630
  - Letterbreen *May* 17, 618; *May* 18, 733
  - Magisterial Jurisdiction *May* 21, 1037

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, Right Hon. GERALD W.—*cont.*
- Piers
  - Ard West, Carna, Connemara *May* 10, 99
  - Kerry
    - Salleen *May* 27, 1426
    - Sneem *May* 31, 1629
- Police
  - Arrangements, Granard *May* 10, 98
  - Force, Kerry *May* 27, 1414
  - Pensioners *May* 25, 1269
- Pollen Act, Lough Neagh *May* 20, 921
- Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill *May* 7, 17; *May* 21, 1028
- Portumna Railway *May* 27, 1415
- Potato Crops
  - Ireland *May* 14, 505
  - Listowel *May* 28, 1512
- Prisons
  - Cork and Tralee *May* 14, 498
  - Maryborough *May* 10, 109; *May* 21, 1025; *May* 27, 1413
- Private Bill Legislation *May* 10, 93
- Publican's Licence, Ireland *May* 20, 924
- Queen's
  - Birthday, Model Schools, Ireland *May* 20, 915
  - Colleges, Ireland *May* 20, 923
  - Reign
    - Royal Irish Constabulary *May* 21, 1030
    - Treason-felony Prisoners *May* 28, 1510
- Railways
  - Light, Ireland *May* 24, 1136; *May* 25, 1264
  - Portumna *May* 27, 1415
- Rathkeale Union, Election of Guardian *May* 21, 1031
- Religious Orders, Ireland *May* 25, 1267
- Royal
  - College of Science, Dublin *May* 21, 1023; *May* 24, 1146
  - Irish Constabulary
    - Queen's Reign *May* 21, 1030
    - Tullyvin (Cavan) *May* 11, 195
- Salleen Pier, Kerry *May* 27, 1426
- Salmon Fishing, Cashen River *May* 25, 1257
- School Attendances, Ireland *May* 27, 1415
- Science Teachers *May* 25, 1260
- Sea Fisheries, Ireland *May* 20, 930
- Shirley and Tennison Estates, Monaghan *May* 24, 1147
- Shorthorn Bulls, Ireland *May* 24, 1146
- Sneem Pier, Kerry *May* 31, 1629
- Strabane
  - Equity Sessions *May* 7, 10
  - Labourers' Cottages *May* 31, 1623
- Supply
  - £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 528, 530, 531, 533, 544, 547, 557, 562
  - £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1103
  - £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1077, 1078, 1080, 1081, 1083, 1086, 1091, 1099, 1101
  - £3,880 for Public Record Offices, Ireland *May* 21, 1107
- Technical Education, Ireland *May* 21, 1023
- Unions
  - Castlebar, Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District *May* 24, 1146
  - Granard *May* 31, 1628

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, Right Hon. GERALD W.—*cont.*
- Unions—*cont.*
  - Mullingar *May* 21, 1031; *May* 27, 1425; *May* 28, 1518
  - Rathkeale, Election of Guardian *May* 21, 1031
  - Workhouse, Longford *May* 27, 1409
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill *May* 18, 730
- Veterinary College, Dublin *May* 13, 386
- Westmeath, Appointment of Sheriff *May* 31, 1628
- Workmistresses, Irish National Schools *May* 24, 1137

BALFOUR, Right Hon. JOHN BLAIR, *Clackmannan and Kinross*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1380; *May* 27, 1438, 1466

BANBURY, Mr. FREDERICK G., *Camberwell, Peckham*
- East London Water Bill *May* 13, 358
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 260

BARNES, Mr. F. G., *Kent, Faversham*
- Civil Uncovenanted Service, India *May* 14, 507

BARRY, Mr. EDWARD, *Cork County, S.*
- Macroom Guardians, Removal of Sick Paupers *May* 20, 916

BARTLEY, Mr. G. C. T., *Islington, N.*
- Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 161
- Elementary Education Act (Amendment) Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 954
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 965
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1054
- Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 212
- Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 224
- Queen's Reign
  - East End Procession *May* 31, 1616
  - Jubilee Day *May* 31, 1615, 1616
- South Kensington Museum *May* 13, 392
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1163, In Com. 1195

BAYLEY, Mr. T., *Derbyshire, Chesterfield*
- Supply: £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 82
- Transvaal, Jameson Raid *May* 7, 8

BEACH, RIGHT HON. SIR M. HICKS, BART. (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *Bristol, W.*
- Alcoholic Beverages *May* 27, 1407
- Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 152, 164, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 177
- Business of the House, Morning Sittings *May* 7, 17
- Equivalent Grant, Scotland *May* 27, 1406
- Excise Prosecution, Marylebone *May* 10, 112

[*cont.*

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. HICKS—*cont.*
  Finance Act, New South Wales *May* 27, 1429
  Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 983, 984, 986, 987, 993, 1007, 1011; *May* 31, 1631
  Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties Expense *May* 11, 254
  Metropolitan Police Courts Bill *May* 7, 15
  Pensions Commutation Board *May* 10, 91
  Post Office
    Annuities *May* 10, 104
    Savings Bank *May* 31, 1604
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9
  Revenue, Great Britain and Ireland *May* 13, 382
  Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 63
  Tithe Redemption, Fees *May* 31, 1634
  University Colleges, Grant *May* 13, 389

BEGG, Mr. F. FAITHFULL, *Glasgow, St. Rollox*
  Business of the House, General *May* 24, 1148
  Telephone Service, Glasgow *May* 20, 928

BELMORE, Earl of
  Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 460

BELPER, LORD (Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms)
  Infant Life Protection Bill, In Com. *May* 13, 315, 323
  Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill 2R. *May* 14, 466

Berriew School Bill
c. 3R., Debate Adj. *May* 24, 1212

BETHELL, Captain G. R., *Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*
  Business of the House, Morning Sittings *May* 7, 17
  Supply
    £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 28, 29, 32
    £29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund *May* 28, 1576
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1648

BHOWNAGGREE, Mr. M. M., *Bethnal Green, N.E.*
  India, Expenditure *May* 20, 936
  Postal Deliveries, Circulars *May* 27, 1430

BIGWOOD, Mr. J., *Middlesex, Brentford*
  Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill, Intro. *May* 12, 312
  Uxbridge Union *May* 24, 1130

BIRRELL, Mr. AUGUSTINE, *Fife, W.*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill 2R. *May* 17, 690

BLUNDELL, Colonel H. B. H., *Lancashire, S.W., Ince*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 812; *May* 24, 1159; In Com. *May* 25, 1324; *May* 31, 1649

BOND, Mr. EDWARD, *Nottingham, E.*
  Polling Arrangements (London) Bill, Intro. *May* 10, 184

BOSCAWEN, Mr. A. S. T. GRIFFITH- (see GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN)

BOULNOIS, Mr. E., *Marylebone, E.*
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 10, 94

BOUSFIELD, Mr. W. R., *Hackney, N.*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1327, 1328, 1340; *May* 27, 1480

BOWLES, Mr. T. GIBSON, *Lynn Regis*
  Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expense *May* 11, 247, 250
  Letters for H.M.'s Ships *May* 17, 614
  Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 906
  Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 221, 222, 231
  South Kensington Museum *May* 28, 1522
  Statute Law Revision and Consolidation Bills *May* 20, 935
  Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Ground *May* 17, 617
  Supply
    £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 26, 61
    £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1552
    £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 66, 73, 74, 77
    £29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund *May* 28, 1576, 1577
    £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 79, 80
    £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1562
    £189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1558
  Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 938
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1151, 1172; In Com. *May* 25, 1307; *May* 26, 1361, 1393

BRIGG, Mr. JOHN, *Yorks, W.R., Keighley*
  Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 262

British Troops in India (Health)
- Earl of Dunraven, (*Motion*) 467; Lord Roberts of Kandahar, 476; Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, 483; Earl of Onslow, 486; Lord Reay, 491; Marquess of Lansdowne, 491; *Adj.* *May* 14
- Debate Resumed: Lord Reay, 581; Lord Lister, 583; Lord Playfair, 589; Duke of Cambridge, 593; Lord Bishop of Southwell, 597; Marquess of Lansdowne, 599; Earl of Kimberley, 606; Lord Clarina, 610; Earl of Dunraven, 611; (*Motion withdrawn*, 612) *May* 17
  - (For Questions see INDIA)

BROADHURST, Mr. HENRY, *Leicester*
- Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill, Intro. *May* 18, 734
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 17, 623, 2R. 667; *May* 18, 794, 795; In Com. *May* 24, 1183; *May* 27, 1441, 1445; *May* 31, 1674, 1702, 1703

BRODRICK, RIGHT HON. WILLIAM ST. JOHN F. (Under Secretary of State for War), *Surrey, Guildford*
- Aldershot Camp, Sewage Farm *May* 11, 196
- Army
  - Horses *May* 10, 104; *May* 13, 365
  - Regulations, Wearing the Shamrock *May* 10, 101, 102, 103
  - Remounts *May* 18, 729
  - Reserve *May* 25, 1258
  - Small Arms Ammunition *May* 13, 360
  - Surgeons, Royal Corps *May* 18, 722
- Artillery Practice, Solent *May* 10, 110
- Battalions Abroad *May* 25, 1254
- Brigade of Guards
  - Medical Department *May* 17, 617
  - Recruits *May* 13, 362, 363
- Cape Garrison *May* 11, 200; *May* 14, 492, 493, 494; *May* 25, 1260
- Cavalry Recruits *May* 24, 1132
- Linked Battalion System *May* 10, 96
- Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 903, 905
- Lock Hospitals *May* 18, 719, 720
- Matabeleland and Mashonaland *May* 13, 385
- Military Prisons *May* 31, 1621
- Militia Field Officers *May* 24, 1133; *May* 25, 1259
- Queen's Reign
  - East End Procession *May* 13, 375; *May* 31, 1616
  - Review of Volunteers *May* 24, 1126
- Royal
  - Corps of Army Surgeons, *May* 18, 722
  - Patriotic Fund
    - Compassionate Allowance *May* 11, 196
    - Supplemental Commission *May* 13, 377
- Scots Greys *May* 7, 5
- Victoria Cross: Trooper Baxter *May* 21, 1022
- Volunteers Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 1012
- Wormwood Scrubbs *May* 14, 504

BROOKFIELD, Mr. A. M., *Sussex, Rye*
- Royal
  - Horse Artillery *May* 31, 1607
  - Patriotic Fund *May* 14, 511

BRUNNER, Sir JOHN T., Bart., *Cheshire, Northwich*
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 1011
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 445
- Notification of Infectious Diseases Act *May* 13, 377
- Queen's Reign, Thanksgiving Service *May* 13, 375
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 763, 766

BRYCE, Right Hon. JAMES, *Aberdeen, S.*
- Cycles, Carriage by Rail *May* 27, 1409
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 429, 430, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439
- Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railways Bill *May* 13, 340, 347, 350, 352
- Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1402

BUCHANAN, Mr. T. R., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
- Chitral Medal *May* 17, 629

BUCKNILL, Mr. T. T., *Surrey, Epsom*
- Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties Expense *May* 11, 246
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1335; *May* 27, 1472

Burial Grounds Loans (Scotland) Bill
- *c.* 2R., Debate Adj. *May* 11, 237

BURNS, Mr. JOHN, *Battersea*
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 413, 415, 431
- Supply: £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1564, 1575
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 680; *May* 24, 1159, 1171, In Com. 1192, 1193, 1202; *May* 26, 1365; *May* 27, 1441, 1442, 1449, 1472; *May* 31, 1682, 1700

BURT, Mr. THOMAS, *Morpeth*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 704; In Com. *May* 26, 1370; *May* 27, 1439

Business of the House (see PARLIAMENT: LORDS; COMMONS)

BUTCHER, Mr. JOHN G., *York City*
- Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill, Intro. *May* 26, 1396
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1153

Buxton, Mr. Sydney, *Tower Hamlets, Poplar*
- Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 171, 172
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 141, 142
- Factory and Workshops Act (1895), Dock and Wharf Machinery *May* 25, 1266
- Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 218
- Transvaal, Immigration Law *May* 7, 17
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1679, 1694

Caldwell, Mr. J., *Lanark, Mid*
- Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 213
- Pensions Commutation Board *May* 10, 90
- Postal Facilities, Island of Lewis *May* 10, 91
- Water Supply, River Nethy *May* 10, 90

Cambridge, His Royal Highness the Duke of
- British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 593

Cameron, Sir Charles, Bart., *Glasgow, Bridgeton*
- Education Department, England *May* 7, 11
- Herrings, Imported *May* 17, 614
- Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 227

Campbell-Bannerman, Right Hon. Sir Henry, *Stirling Burghs*
- Business of the House, General *May* 25, 1272
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1053
- Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 47, 53
- Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 938

Camperdown, Earl of
- Light Railways Act *May* 28, 1502
- Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 1R. *May* 13, 337; 2R. *May* 20, 885

Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* Withdrawn *May* 10, 183
- (For Questions see Ireland)

Canals Protection (London) Bill
- *c.* Withdrawn *May* 27, 1487

Canterbury, Lord Archbishop of *(Dr. Frederick Temple)*
- British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 483

Carew, Mr. J. L., *Dublin, College Green*
- Collection of Rates, Dublin *May* 10, 113
- College of Science, Dublin *May* 24, 1145
- Gambling in Futures and Options *May* 10, 92
- Irish Schools, Epidemic Disease *May* 24, 1134
- Private Bill Legislation, Ireland *May* 10, 93
- Queen's Reign, Adverse Records *May* 17, 630

Carson, Right Hon. Edward H., *Dublin University*
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1046, 1061
- Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 517, 523, 524, 531, 534, 548

Causton, Mr. R. K., *Southwark, W.*
- Queen's Reign, Evictions in Southwark *May* 25, 1262

Cawley, Mr. Frederick, *Lancashire, S.E., Prestwich*
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 258
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1189

Cecil, Lord Hugh, *Greenwich*
- Business of the House, Supply: Ordnance Factory Vote *May* 20, 924
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 145
- Llanbedr School Board *May* 31, 1622, 1623
- Magnetic Observatory, Greenwich *May* 28, 1520
- Supply: £189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1557, 1561

Chaff-cutting Machines Accidents Bill
- *c.* Order for Com. Read and Discharged; com. to Standing Com. on Trade, etc. *May* 12, 311

Chaloner, Captain R. G. W., *Wilts, Westbury*
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 20, 913

CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. J. AUSTEN (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Worcestershire, E.*
- Plymouth Harbour Works *May* 13, 360
- Queen's Reign, Naval Review *May* 18, 725
- Supply: £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1550, 1552, 1556

CHAMBERLAIN, Right Hon. JOSEPH (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Birmingham, W.*
- British Zukon Chartered Company *May* 31, 1631
- Canadian
  - Fast Atlantic Service *May* 25, 1268
  - Mail Service *May* 31, 1619
- Compensation Allowances, European and Indian Officials *May* 20, 934
- Falkland Islands *May* 7, 16
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 419, 423, 426, 429, 430, 431, 433, 439
- Mashonaland *May* 31, 1626, 1627
- Queensland *May* 10, 112; *May* 25, 1256
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Invitations *May* 28, 1509

cont

CHAMBERLAIN, Right Hon. JOSEPH—*cont.*
Transvaal
Immigration Law *May* 7, 17
Jameson Raid *May* 7, 8
Treason-felony Prisoners, Ireland *May* 7, 16
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 789, 793, 794, 795, 805, 811; *May* 24, 1168, 1170, 1171; In Com. 1197, 1198, 1199, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1211; *May* 25, 1281, 1297, 1305, 1308, 1309, 1313, 1316, 1327, 1331, 1341; *May* 26, 1352, 1358, 1363, 1370, 1379, 1380, 1387, 1389, 1390, 1392, 1393; *May* 27, 1443, 1445, 1446, 1458, 1471, 1472, 1474, 1476, 1477, 1479, 1484, 1485; *May* 31, 1650, 1664, 1677

CHANNING, Mr. F. A., *Northampton, E.*
Business of the House, General *May* 28, 1523
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 123, 125
Ground Game Act (Extension to Copyholders) Bill, Intro. *May* 18, 734
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 849
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 351
Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1399
Railway Drawings and Relics *May* 31, 1624
Supply: £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1577, 1590

CHAPLIN, RIGHT HON. HENRY (President of the Local Government Board), *Lincolnshire, Sleaford*
Board of Guardians, Public Bills *May* 17, 628
Cattle Food, Imported *May* 31, 1631
County Council, Accounts *May* 13, 378
Death of Pauper, City of London *May* 21, 1035
East London Water Bill *May* 13, 359
Housing of the Working Classes Act *May* 18, 722
Metropolitan Water Companies Bill, 1R. *May* 24, 1149
Newington Vestry Election *May* 27, 1419
Notification of Infectious Diseases Act *May* 13, 377
Rating Assessment *May* 13, 371
Uxbridge Union *May* 24, 1131
Vaccination
Lymph Supply *May* 27, 1426
Royal Commission *May* 13, 361
Water Supply, London *May* 17, 615, 616

CHARITY COMMISSION
Parliamentary Charity Commissioner – Mr. J. GRANT LAWSON
Berriew School Scheme, *Q.* Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1621
Charity Scheme, Thornton-in-Craven, *Qs.* Mr. P. J. Stanhope; *As.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 20, 927
Covent Garden Theatre Fund, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 18, 729. *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 31, 1603
Swansea Grammar School, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
Upper Division Clerks, *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 190

Church Patronage Transfer Bill
l. 2R., Lord Archbishop of York, 465, 466; Lord Halsbury, 465; Lord Herschell, 465 *May* 14
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 14, 466
In Com., Rep. without Amendt. and re-com. to Standing Com. *May* 28, 1501

CIVIL SERVICE
Charity Commission, Upper Division Clerks, *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 190
Clerks, *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1605
Education Department Examiners, *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 11, 191
Indian Uncovenanted, *Q.* Mr. F. G. Barnes; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 14, 507
Judge Advocate General's Department, *Qs.* Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. J. W. Mellor; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1635
Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee (see that Title)
Second Division Clerks, *Q.* Mr. T. P. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 622
Temporary Men Copyists, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1513

CLANCY, Mr. J. J., *Dublin, N.*
Balbriggan Harbour *May* 13, 388
Business of the House, General *May* 28, 1524
Labourers' Cottages, Meath *May* 10, 114
Loughshinny Pier, Dublin *May* 13, 387
Private Bill Legislation, Ireland *May* 10, 93
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 303, 304
Supply
£24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc. *May* 28, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1541, 1542
£8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 63, 64, 65
£7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 78, 79
£132,291 for Survey of United Kingdom *May* 28, 1529, 1530, 1537

CLARINA, Lord
British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 610

CLARK, Dr. G. B., *Caithness*
Supply
£18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1557
£189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1561

CLARKE, Sir EDWARD, *Plymouth*
Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expense *May* 11, 251
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1359, 1369

CLIFDEN, Viscount
Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1501
Griffith's Valuation *May* 24, 1116
Land
Legislation, Ireland *May* 28, 1505
Valuation, Ireland *May* 13, 338, 339
Personal Explanation *May* 31, 1593

CLONBROCK, Lord
Land Legislation, Ireland *May* 25, 1251; *May* 28, 1505
Personal Explanation *May* 31, 1593

CLOUGH, Mr. W. O., *Portsmouth*
Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 260

COCHRANE, Hon. THOMAS H., *Ayrshire, N.*
Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 421
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 27, 1466

COGHILL, Mr. D. H., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Elementary Teachers, Pensions Fund *May* 10, 118

COHEN, Mr. B. L., *Islington, E.*
Business of the House, General *May* 10, 116
Supply: £189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1558

COLERIDGE, Lord
Juries Detention Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 86; *May* 28, 1503

COLLINGS, RIGHT HON. JESSE (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Birmingham, Bordesley*
Discharge of Weavers, Burnley *May* 14, 500
Italian Ice-cream Vendors *May* 21, 1029
Laundry Workers *May* 14, 507
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 207, 216, 217
Metropolitan Police Courts Bill *May* 7, 14
Mining Accident, Durham *May* 7, 18
Performing Bears, Streets *May* 14, 506
Probation of First Offenders Act *May* 21, 1034
Queen's Reign
  Jubilee Procession *May* 21, 1029
  Metropolitan Police *May* 21, 1029

COLOMB, Sir JOHN, *Great Yarmouth*
Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1071
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1699

Colonial Solicitors Bill
c. Intro., Sir A. K. Rollit; Read 1° *May* 12, 312

COLONIES
Secretary of State—Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN
Under Secretary of State—Earl of SELBORNE
British Zukon Chartered Company, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1631
Canadian
  Fast Atlantic Service, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 25, 1267
  Mail Service, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1619

COLONIES—cont.
Cape Garrison, Qs. Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Swift MacNeill; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 492. *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 25, 1260
Compensation Allowance, European and Indian Officials, Qs. Sir W. Wedderburn; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, Lord G. Hamilton *May* 20, 934
Crown Colonies, Representatives of, Queen's Reign, Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 28, 1509
Falkland Islands, Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 16
Finance Act, New South Wales, Q. Mr. R. Cox; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 27, 1429
Jameson Raid, Transvaal, Q. Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 8
Mail Service, Canadian, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1619
Manitoba
  Colonisation Board, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 25, 1261
  Crofters' Settlement, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 18, 730
Mashonaland, Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. J. Morley; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1626
Matabeleland and Mashonaland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 385
Queensland, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 10, 112. *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 25, 1256
Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee (see that Title)
Transvaal
  Immigration Law, Q. Mr. Sydney Buxton; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 17
  Jameson Raid, Q. Mr. T. Bayley; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 8
Treason-felony Prisoners, Ireland, Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 15

Commons (Regulation) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. H. C. F. Luttrell; Read 1° *May* 11, 204

Conveyancing Bill
l. 2R., Lord Davey, 325, 327; Lord Halsbury, 327 *May* 13
Read 2ª and Referred to Select Com. *May* 13, 327

COOKE, Mr. C. W. RADCLIFFE, *Hereford*
Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 241
Supply: £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1578

Copyright (Amendment) Bill
l. Pres., Lord Monkswell; Read 1ª *May* 13, 313
2R., Lord Monkswell, 1594; Earl of Dudley, 1598; Lord Thring, 1599; Lord Herschell, 1599; Lord Halsbury, 1601 *May* 31
Read 2ª and Referred to Select Com. *May* 31, 1602

[*cont.*

Cotton Cloth and Other Factories Bill
- c. Read 2° *May* 31, 1711

Cotton-Jodrell, Colonel Edward T. D., *Cheshire, Wirral*
- District Councils (Water Supply Facilities) Bill, Intro. *May* 18, 734

Courtney, Right Hon. L. H., *Cornwall, Bodmin*
- Business of the House, General *May* 17, 633

Cox, Mr. R., *Edinburgh, S.*
- Finance Act, New South Wales *May* 27, 1429
- St. Andrews University *May* 14, 500

Cox, Mr. T. Skewes- (see Skewes-Cox)

Cranborne, Viscount, *Rochester*
- Benefices Bill *May* 21, 1038, 1039
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill *May* 10, 121, In Com. 134, 141, 150

Cranbrook, Earl of
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1225

Crawford and Balcarres, Earl of
- Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1496

Crete (see Foreign Office)

Crilly, Mr. D., *Mayo, N.*
- Death of Pauper, City of London *May* 21, 1035
- Mersey Channels Bill, 3R. *May* 10, 183
- Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 178
- Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, 2R. *May* 14, 491, 492; *May* 17, 613, 614
- Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1101, 1102

Cripps, Mr. C. A., *Gloucester, Stroud*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 708; In Com. *May* 25, 1277; *May* 26, 1349, 1357, 1383; *May* 27, 1470, 1479

Crombie, Mr. John W., *Kincardineshire*
- Divisions, House of Commons *May* 18, 721
- Dog Licence, Drumlithie, Kincardineshire *May* 14, 501
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1311; *May* 31, 1669

Cross, Mr. A., *Glasgow, Camlachie*
- Flax, Foreign Bounties *May* 18, 721, 722
- Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 348
- Queen's Reign, Naval Review *May* 18, 725
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1164

CROSS, Viscount (Lord Privy Seal)
- Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1499, 1501
- Light Railways Act *May* 28, 1502

Currie, Sir Donald, *Perthshire, W.*
- Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 342, 346
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1694

CURZON, Right Hon. GEORGE N. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lancashire; S.W., Southport*
- Armistice *May* 21, 1039; *May* 24, 1143
- Brussels Act *May* 21, 1035
- Congo State *May* 11, 193; *May* 18, 720
- Crete *May* 13, 380, 381; *May* 14, 508; *May* 17, 626; *May* 20, 931; *May* 24, 1143; *May* 25, 1270; *May* 31, 1637
- Delagoa Bay, Arbitration Award *May* 28, 1520
- Dingley Tariff Bill, United States *May* 25, 1268
- Duty on Herrings *May* 24, 1136
- Expulsion of Mr. Macpherson from Paris *May* 11, 194
- Fugitive Slaves, Zanzibar Coast *May* 21, 1025; *May* 28, 1517
- Herrings
  - Duty on *May* 24, 1136
  - Scotch, St. Petersburg *May* 13, 380
- Kassala *May* 20, 915
- Liquor Traffic in Africa *May* 31, 1608
- Murder of Yusaf Yunan *May* 31, 1617, 1618
- Queen's Reign, Foreign Consular Corps *May* 24, 1127
- Raiatea, Disturbances *May* 10, 104
- Scotch Herrings, St. Petersburg *May* 13, 380
- Slavery in Zanzibar *May* 14, 506
- Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 25, 31, 33, 38, 46, 53
- Tokat Massacre *May* 21, 1036; *May* 25, 1258
- Trawling, Moray Firth *May* 25, 1256
- Turco-Greek War *May* 10, 100; *May* 20, 927; *May* 24, 1143
- Uganda Railway *May* 27, 1430
- Zanzibar *May* 28, 1516

CUSTOMS, EXCISE, AND INLAND REVENUE
- *Alcoholic Beverages, Qs.* Mr. T. Lough; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 27, 1407
- *Custom House, London, Q.* Mr. C. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1135
- *Dog Licences*
  - *Drumlithie, Kincardineshire, Q.* Mr. J. W. Crombie; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 501
  - *Govan, Q.* Mr. J. Wilson (Lanark); *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1026

[cont.

CUSTOMS, EXCISE, AND INLAND REVENUE—cont.
  Excise Prosecution, Marylebone, Q. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 10, 111
  Gun and Game Licences, Ireland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1630
  Inhabited House Duty, Scotland, Q. Sir T. Sutherland; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1404
  Licences
    Dog (see subhead *Dog* above)
    Gun and Game, Ireland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1630
    Publican's, Ireland, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 923
  Publican's Licence, Ireland, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 923
  Queen's Reign, Income Tax, Q. Mr. J. W. Maclure; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 7, 9
  Stamp Duty, Ireland, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 625
  Tithe Redemption Fees, Q. Mr. A. F. Jeffreys; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 31, 1634

DALBIAC, Colonel P. H., *Camberwell, N.*
  Performing Bears, Streets *May* 14, 506
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 14, 495

DALRYMPLE, Sir C., Bart., *Ipswich*
  Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 344
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 24, 1127

DALY, Mr. JAMES, *Monaghan, S.*
  Charge of Larceny, Tyrone *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269; *May* 27, 1422, 1423
  Deportation of Paupers *May* 13, 374; *May* 14, 509; *May* 17, 631
  Grand Jury Accounts, Monaghan *May* 24, 1147
  Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland *May* 7, 12
  Irish Mail Service *May* 10, 97; *May* 11, 195
  Jurors Challenged, Tyrone *May* 31, 1616
  Labourers' Cottages, Ireland *May* 20, 919
  Land Commission
    Carrickmacross and Ballybay *May* 11, 192
    Castleblaney *May* 7, 12
  Longford Union Workhouse *May* 27, 1409
  Mersey Docks Bill *May* 27, 1423
  National School Monitors, Ireland *May* 27, 1405
  Police Pensioners *May* 25, 1269
  Postal Facilities, Cavan *May* 27, 1404
  Post Office Establishment *May* 11, 200
  Queen's Reign, Treason-felony Prisoners *May* 28, 1510
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 273, 280, 281
  Shirley and Tennison Estates Monaghan *May* 24, 1147
[*cont.*

DALY, Mr. JAMES—*cont.*
  Supply
    £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 75
    £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 578, 579
    £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1067, 1071, 1080
  Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 261; *May* 12, 265; *May* 18, 730
  Volunteers' Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 1012

DALZIEL, Mr. J. H., *Kirkcaldy Burghs*
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 399, 401, 426

DANE, Mr. R. M., *Fermanagh, N.*
  High Sheriff, Carrickfergus *May* 14, 504
  Irish Mail Service *May* 17, 625
  Loan Fund Societies, Ireland *May* 10, 108
  Supply: £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1104, 1105

Dangerous Performances Bill
c. Read 2° *May* 31, 1707

DAVEY, Lord
  Conveyancing Bill, 2R, *May* 13, 325, 327

DAVIES, Mr. M. VAUGHAN, *Cardigan*
  Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 817

DAVITT, Mr. MICHAEL, *Mayo, S.*
  Reading Prison, Discharge of Warder *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420

DENBIGH, Earl of
  Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 461
  Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1235
  Infant Life Protection Bill, In Com. *May* 13, 316, 318, 321, 324; *May* 21, 1020
  Land Law (Ireland) Acts *May* 20, 902
  Land Valuation, Ireland *May* 13, 339
  Municipal Franchise, Ireland *May* 20, 896
  Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill, In Com. *May* 11, 186, 187, 188

DENNY, Colonel J. McA., *Kilmarnock Burghs*
  Supply: £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1574
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1173; In Com. 1210; *May* 25, 1303, 1306, 1314; *May* 26, 1392; *May* 27, 1464, 1480; *May* 31, 1689, 1690

DEVONSHIRE, DUKE OF (Lord President of the Council)
  Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1217; In Com *May* 28, 1503
  Secondary Education *May* 21, 1019

DILKE, Right Hon. Sir CHARLES W., Bart., *Gloucester, Forest of Dean*
- Battalions Abroad *May* 25, 1254
- Brigade of Guards *May* 13, 363
- Brussels Act *May* 21, 1035
- Business of the House, General *May* 28 1524
- Cleaning Machinery in Motion *May* 28, 1506
- Congo State *May* 11, 193 ; *May* 18, 720
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 124, 129, 149
- Fugitive Slaves, Zanzibar Coast *May* 21, 1025 ; *May* 28, 1516
- Government Offices, Sites *May* 14, 495
- Kassala *May* 20, 915
- Linked Battalion System *May* 10, 96
- Liquor Traffic in Africa *May* 31, 1608
- Supply
  - £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1585
  - £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 62
  - £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1561
- Truck Act, 1896 *May* 24, 1128, 1129
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 10, 107 ; *May* 17, 624, 2R. 658, 663 ; *May* 24, 1162 ; In Com. *May* 25, 1274, 1275, 1277, 1296, 1300 ; *May* 27, 1433, 1464, 1465, 1471, 1482 ; *May* 31, 1666, 1691, 1701
- Workmen (Compensation Insurance) Bill, Belgium *May* 18, 729

DILLON, Mr. JOHN, *Mayo, E.*
- Ballinamore Canal *May* 20, 909
- Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 166
- Business of the House, General *May* 11, 203 ; *May* 25, 1272
- Certificated Teachers, Scotland *May* 24, 1142
- Charge of Larceny, Tyrone *May* 27, 1423
- Commissioners of Public Works, Ireland *May* 13, 366
- Crete *May* 13, 380, 381 ; *May* 14, 508 ; *May* 25, 1270 ; *May* 31, 1636, 1637
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 1011 ; *May* 31, 1631
- Indian Midland, and Bengal-Nagpur Railways *May* 20, 924
- Labourers' Cottages, Ireland *May* 20, 918
- Land Commission, Ireland *May* 20, 925, 926 ; *May* 31, 1603
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1044, 1048, 1049, 1059
- Ordnance Survey, Mayo *May* 13, 389 ; *May* 17, 626
- Pollen Act, Lough Neagh *May* 20, 921
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment Bill *May* 27, 1431
- Sneem Pier, Kerry *May* 31, 1629
- Supply
  - £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 29
  - £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1557
  - £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 67, 68, 74
  - £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 533, 541, 544, 547, 548, 562, 577

DILLON, Mr. JOHN—*cont.*
- Supply—*cont.*
  - £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1103, 1104
  - £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1095
  - £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1566, 1569, 1572
  - £132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1525, 1531, 1532, 1533
- Turco-Greek War *May* 20, 926

District Councils (Water Supply Facilities) Bill
- *c.* Intro., Colonel Cotton-Jodrell ; Read 1° *May* 18, 734

DONELAN, Captain A. J. C., *Cork, E.*
- Antiquities, Ireland *May* 27, 1410
- Army
  - Food and Forage Supplies *May* 31, 1626
  - Horses *May* 10, 104
  - Regulations, Wearing the Shamrock *May* 10, 102, 103
- Cruelty to Animals, London *May* 27, 1410, 1411
- Fishing Inquiry, Listowel *May* 31, 1633
- Gun and Game Licences, Ireland *May* 31, 1630
- Industrial Schools *May* 25, 1258
- Irish Mail Service *May* 25, 1265
- Judiciary, Ireland *May* 21, 1038
- Labourers' Cottages, Ireland *May* 17, 623
- Land Commission, Ireland *May* 31, 1603
- Land Law (Ireland) Act 1887 *May* 25, 1265
- Light Railways, Ireland *May* 25, 1264
- Matabeleland and Mashonaland *May* 13, 385
- Petty Sessions Fees, Limerick *May* 31, 1629
- Potato Crop, Ireland *May* 14, 505
- Supply : £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1061

DOOGAN, Mr. P. C., *Tyrone, E.*
- Drainage Works, Ireland *May* 27, 1431
- Fermanagh School Estate *May* 31, 1622
- Pollen Act, Lough Neagh *May* 20, 920

DOUGLAS, Right Hon. A. AKERS- (see AKERS-DOUGLAS)

DRAGE, Mr. GEOFFREY, *Derby*
- Tuskar Light, Telephonic Communication *May* 10, 93 ; *May* 27, 1405
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 636 ; *May* 18, 813

Dublin Corporation Bill
- *l.* Read 2^{a} *May* 14, 453
- Marquess of Londonderry, (*Instr. to Com.*) 453, 462, 464 ; Earl of Morley, 457 ; Earl of Mayo, 459 ; Earl of Belmore, 460 ; Earl of Denbigh, 461 ; Lord Halsbury 461, 464 ; Earl of Kimberley, 462 ; Duke of Rutland, 162 ; (*Division*, 463) *May* 14

[*cont.*

DUDLEY, EARL OF (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade)
• Copyright Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 31, 1598

DUNCOMBE, Hon. H. V., *Cumberland, Egremont*
Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 579

DUNRAVEN, Earl of
British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 467; *May* 17, 611

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. HART., Bart., *Kent, Dartford*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 130, 149
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 847
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1674

East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill
l. 2R., Earl of Onslow *May* 13, 313
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 13, 313
In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 14, 466
Read 3ª and Passed *May* 17, 612

East London Water Bill
c. Mr. E. Gray, (*Instr. to Com.*), 353, 360; Colonel Lockwood, 356; Mr. T. C. T. Warner, 358; Mr. T. G. Banbury, 358; Mr. H. Chaplin, 359; (*Motion withdrawn*, 360) *May* 13

Edinburgh University (Transfer of Patronage) Bill
l. Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 14, 491
In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 17, 613
Read 3ª and Passed *May* 18, 718

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Lord President—Duke of DEVONSHIRE
Vice President—Sir JOHN E. GORST
Antiquities, Ireland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 27, 1410. *Q.* Mr. W. E. H. Lecky; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1519
Berriew School Scheme, Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1621
British Museum, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1636
Centre Superintendents, Ireland, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 912
Certificated Teachers, Scotland, Qs. Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1142

[*cont.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—cont.
Colleges
Queen's, Ireland, Qs. Mr. J. Pinkerton, Mr. W. Johnston; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 922
Royal, of Science, Dublin, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
University Grant, Q. Mr. A. J. Mundella; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 13, 389
Dublin
Education Office, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1027
Royal College of Science, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
Education
Department
England, Female Sub-Inspectors, Q. Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 7, 11
Junior Examiners, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1612
Half-time Scholars, Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 92
Office, Dublin, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1027
Elementary
Education Act, Age Clause, Q. Mr. A. Spicer; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 631
Schools (see subhead *Schools* below)
Teachers' Pension Fund, Q. Mr. D. H. Coghill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 118
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 7, 6
(For Debates see Title of Bill)
Epidemic, Irish Schools, Q. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
Examiners (Education Department)
Appointments of, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 11, 191
Junior, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1612
Fermanagh School Estate, Q. Mr. P. C. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
Half-time Scholars, Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 92
Honiton
Elementary School, Holy Week, Q. Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 498
National Schools, Q. Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
Industrial Schools, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1258
Intermediate Education (see EDUCATION: INTERMEDIATE AND TECHNICAL)
Irish
Antiquities, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 27, 1410. *Q.* Mr. W. E. H. Lecky; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1519
Schools, Epidemic, Q. Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
Llanbedr School Board, Qs. Lord H. Cecil; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 31, 1622
Llangollen School Board, Qs. Mr. J. H. Roberts; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632

[*cont.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT— cont.
- *Model Schools*
  - *Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
  - *Queen's Birthday*, *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
- *Monitors, National Schools*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
- *Museums*
  - *British*, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1636
  - *South Kensington*, *Qs.* Mr. Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. A. J. Mundella, Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 392. *Qs.* Lord Warkworth, Mr. T. Skewes-Cox, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 28, 1522. *Qs.* Sir F. S. Powell, Mr. C. A. Whitmore; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1614
- *National*
  - *Schools* (see subhead *Schools* below)
  - *Schools, Irish* (see under Title Ireland)
  - *School Teachers, Irish* (see under Title Ireland)
- *North Mundham School Board*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Williams; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1129
- *Queen's*
  - *Birthday, Model Schools, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
  - *Colleges, Ireland*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Pinkerton, Mr. W. Johnston; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 922
- *Queen's Reign*
  - *Holiday for Schools*, *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 494. *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 914
  - *Science and Art Department Examinations*, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 21, 1030
- *Royal*
  - *College of Science, Dublin*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
  - *Irish Academy*, *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 10, 105
- *St. Andrews University*, *Q.* Mr. R. Cox; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 14, 500
- *School Boards*
  - *Divisions, London*, *Q.* Mr. T. G. Fardell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1128
  - *Llanbedr*, *Qs.* Lord H. Cecil; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 31, 1622
  - *Llangollen*, *Qs.* Mr. J. H. Roberts; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632
  - *Loans*, *Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
  - *North Mundham*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Williams; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1129
- *Schools*
  - *Attendance, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
  - *Berriew Scheme*, *Q.* Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1621
  - *Elementary, Honiton, Holy Week*, *Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 498

[*cont.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—cont.
- *Schools*—cont.
  - *Estate, Fermanagh*, *Q.* Mr. P. C. Doogan *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
  - *Grammar, Swansea*, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
  - *Industrial*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1258 .
  - *Irish*
    - *Epidemic*, *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
    - *National* (see under Title Ireland)
  - *Jubilee Holiday*, *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 494. *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 914
  - *Model*
    - *Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
    - *Queen's Birthday*, *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
  - *National*
    - *Honiton*, *Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
    - *Monitors*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
    - *Teachers' Fund, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 619
  - *Science and Art, Grants*, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall: *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 13, 367
  - *Swansea Grammar*, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
- *Science and Art*
  - *Classes, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 21, 1036
  - *Schools, Grants*, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 13, 367
- *Science Teachers*, *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1260
- *Secondary Education*, *Q.* Lord Norton; *A.* Duke of Devonshire *May* 21, 1017. *Q.* Mr. A. J. Mundella; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1133
- *South Kensington Museum*, *Qs.* Mr. Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. A. J. Mundella, Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 392. *Qs.* Lord Warkworth, Mr. T. Skewes-Cox, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 28, 1522. *Qs.* Sir F. S. Powell, Mr. C. A. Whitmore; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1614
- *Swansea Grammar School*, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
- *Teachers*
  - *Certificated, Scotland*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1142
  - *Elementary Pension Fund*, *Q.* Mr. D. H. Coghill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 118
  - *Science*, *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1260
- *Teachers' (Superannuation) Bill*, *Q.* Mr. W. Younger; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 27, 1430
- *Technical Education* (see Education: Intermediate and Technical)
- *University*
  - *Colleges, Grant*, *Q.* Mr. A. J. Mundella; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 13, 389
  - *Edinburgh*, *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1263

[*cont*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—cont.
- *University of London Bill*, *Q.* Mr. Brynmor Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 632
- *Voluntary Schools Act*, *Q.* Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 7, 5. *Q.* Mr. T. G. Ashton; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 10, 92. *Qs.* Mr. E. Gray, Mr. J. W. Mellor; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 13, 373. *Q.* Mr. J. W. Sidebotham; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 20, 935
- *Workmistresses, Irish National Schools*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137

Education (Intermediate and Technical)
- *Swansea Grammar School*, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
- *Technical*
  - *Committee*, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 502
  - *Education, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1023

Elections Petitions Bill
c. Withdrawn *May* 24, 1215

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill
c. On the Order to go into Com.: Instructions stood in the names of Viscount Cranborne and Mr. S. T. Evans; [Mr. Speaker ruled both these Instructions out of Order, 122;] Sir H. Fowler, 122 *May* 10
In Com., Mr. J. H. Yoxall, (*Amendt.*) 123; Sir J. Gorst, (*Amendt.*) 123, 124, 125, 132, 138, 151; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 123); Mr. A. H. D. Acland, 123, 126, 151; Mr. F. A. Channing, 123, 125; Mr. E. Gray, 123, 124, 128, 150; Mr. A. J. Mundella, 124; Sir C. Dilke, 124, 129, 149; Sir J. Lubbock, 125, 144; (*Amendt. Agreed to*, 126); Mr. S. T. Evans, 128; Mr. J. Stuart, 130, 147; Sir W. Hart Dyke, 130, 149; Sir H. Fowler, 131; Viscount Cranborne, [*New Clause*] 134, 141, 150; Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, 140; Mr. Sydney Buxton, 141, 142; Mr. J. G. Talbot, 142; Mr. J. C. Williams, 143; Mr. J. H. Yoxall, 145; Lord H. Cecil, 145; Sir F. S. Powell, 148; (*Division*, 151); Mr. J. Samuel, 151. Preamble Agreed to, 151 *May* 10
Rep. with an Amendt., Mr. A. H. D. Acland, 152; Mr. A. J. Balfour 152 *May* 10
Considered as Amended *May* 11, 204
3R., Mr. J. Hutton, 941; Mr. R. W. Perks, 942; Colonel Milward, 944; Mr. G. Lambert, 945; Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth, 947; Sir J. Gorst, 948; Mr. A. H. D. Acland, 950; Mr. E. Gray, 951; Mr. J. C. Williams, 952; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 954 *May* 20
Read 3° and Passed *May* 20, 954
l. Read 1ª *May* 21, 1017
2R., Duke of Devonshire, 1217; Lord Playfair, 1223; Earl of Cranbrook, 1225; Lord Reay, 1226; Lord Norton, 1229; Earl of Kimberley, 1231 *May* 25
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 25, 1234

[*cont.*

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill—cont.
In Com., Duke of Devonshire, 1503; Earl of Kimberley, 1504 *May* 28
Rep. without Amendt., Standing Com. negatived *May* 28, 1504
Read 3ª and Passed *May* 31, 1602
(For Questions see EDUCATION DEPARTMENT)

Elementary Education (Permissive Rates Aid) Bill
c. Withdrawn *May* 18, 814

ELLIS, Mr. J. E., *Notts, Rushcliffe*
Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 24, 25, 26
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 20, 933

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill
c. Mr. J. G. Butcher, (*Application for leave to Intro.*) *May* 26, 1396
Intro., Mr. J. G. Butcher; Read 1° *May* 26, 1396

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. A. D. Provand; Read 1° *May* 27, 1488

EVANS, Mr. S. T., *Glamorgan, Mid*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill *May* 10, 121, In. Com. 128
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, (*Instrs. to Com.*) 1152; In Com. *May* 25, 1339, 1342

EVANS, Sir FRANCIS H., *Southampton*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1196, 1197, 1201, 1203, 1204; *May* 31, 1676, 1690, 1696

Excise Licences Bill
l. Pres., Viscount Peel; Read 1ª *May* 25, 1217

Extraordinary Tithe Bill
c. 2R., Mr. W. H. Long *May* 11, 231
Read 2° *May* 11, 232

FARDELL, Mr. T. G., *Paddington, S.*
Paris Fire, Safety of Public Buildings *May* 10, 95
School Board Divisions, London *May* 24, 1128

FARQUHARSON, Dr. R., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
Army Surgeons, Royal Corps *May* 18, 722
Brigade of Guards, Medical Department *May* 17, 617
Inebriates, Reformatories *May* 14, 510
Wallace Bequest, Manchester House *May* 13, 392
Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 937

FARRELL, Mr. J. P., *Cavan, W.*
- Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill *May* 14, 501
- Annaly Estate, Longford *May* 28, 1507
- Ardagh (Longford) Burial Ground *May* 11, 198
- Army
  - Horses *May* 13, 364, 365
  - Service Record: Deniston (Joseph) *May* 27, 1408
- Ballinamore Canal *May* 20, 908; *May* 27, 1407
- Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 165
- Business of the House, General *May* 10, 119; *May* 13, 394; *May* 28, 1524
- Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill *May* 10, 106
- Canals, Ireland *May* 18, 723
- Cavan
  - Distress Relief Works *May* 28, 1517
  - Royal Irish Constabulary, Tullyvin *May* 11, 195
- Civil Service, Temporary Men Copyists *May* 28, 1513
- Distress Relief Works, Cavan *May* 28, 1517
- Education Office, Dublin *May* 21, 1027
- Eviction, Longford *May* 7, 3
- Granard, Police Arrangements *May* 10, 98
- Grand Jury System, Ireland *May* 18, 723
- Irish Mail Service *May* 11, 194, 195; *May* 14, 496
- Italian Ice-cream Vendors *May* 21, 1028
- Labourers (Ireland) Acts *May* 27, 1408
- Land
  - Law (Ireland) Acts, Royal Commission *May* 24, 1148, 1149
  - Rating, Ireland *May* 20, 936
  - Sub-Commissions *May* 13, 363; *May* 17, 620
- Letterbreen Petty Sessions *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732; *May* 20, 931
- Loan Fund Societies, Ireland *May* 10, 108
- Longford
  - Annaly Estate *May* 28, 1507
  - Ardagh Burial Ground *May* 11, 198
  - Canal Harbour *May* 7, 4; *May* 18, 726; *May* 28, 1514
  - Eviction *May* 7, 3
- National School Teachers' Fund, Ireland *May* 17, 619
- Parliamentary Correspondence, Postage *May* 13, 365
- Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, 2R. *May* 14, 492
- Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill *May* 7, 17; *May* 21, 1028
- Post Office Establishments *May* 11, 200
- Railway Rates, Ireland *May* 11, 189
- Rooskey Bridge, Roscommon *May* 24, 1139
- Royal
  - Irish Constabulary, Tullyvin, Cavan *May* 11, 195
  - Patriotic Fund *May* 11, 195
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill 2R. *May* 12, 301
- Stationery Office *May* 28, 1510
- Supply
  - £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 73
  - £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 561

FARRELL, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
- Supply—*cont.*
  - £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1062
  - £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 82
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 259
- Workmistresses, Irish National Schools *May* 24, 1137

FENWICK, Mr. CHARLES, *Northumberland, Wansbeck*
- Mining Accident, Durham *May* 7, 18
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 775; In Com. *May* 25, 1284, 1318; *May* 26, 1367; *May* 27, 1442, 1460, 1471

FERGUSSON, Right Hon. Sir J., Bart., *Manchester, N.E.*
- Business of the House, General *May* 13, 393; *May* 28, 1523
- Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 242

FIELD, Admiral, *Sussex, Eastbourne*
- Royal Marines, Reserve *May* 14, 507

FIELD, Mr. W., *Dublin, St. Patrick*
- Agricultural Rating Act, Ireland *May* 24, 1142
- Army Remounts *May* 25, 1270
- College of Science, Dublin *May* 28, 1520
- Gambling in Produce Futures *May* 28, 1519
- Irish Fisheries *May* 27, 1414
- Portumna Railway *May* 27, 1415
- Queen's Reign, Treason-felony Prisoners *May* 27, 1412
- School Attendances, Ireland *May* 27, 1415
- Science Teachers *May* 25, 1260
- Supply: £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc. *May* 28, 1546

Finance Acts (Works of Art)
- Earl Stanhope, (*Motion*) 1489, 1501; Earl of Leven and Melville, 1493; Lord Leconfield, 1494; Lord Kelvin, 1495; Earl of Crawford, 1496; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 1498; Viscount Cross, 1499, 1501; Viscount Clifden, 1501; (*Motion negatived*, 1501) *May* 28

Finance Bill
- *c.* Read 1° *May* 11, 205
  - 2R., Mr. J. Lowther, (*Amendt.*) 954, 963, 987, 993, 995, 1010; Mr. G. Harwood, 963, 979; Mr. Vesey Knox, 964, 965; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 965; Captain Pretyman, 968, 973, 974, 975, 996, 1002; Sir W. Harcourt, 973, 994, 995, 996, 998, 1002, 1008; Sir H. Fowler, 973, 974, 975, 1010; Mr. T. Lough, 981, 983; Sir M. Hicks Beach, 983, 984, 986, 987, 993, 1007, 1011; Sir H. Maxwell, 984; Major Rasch, 1009; Mr. J. Dillon, 1011; Sir J. T. Brunner, 1011; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1012) *May* 20
  - Read 2° *May* 20, 1012
  - In Com., R.P. *May* 24, 1213
  - (For Questions see WAYS AND MEANS)

[cont.

FINCH-HATTON, Hon. HAROLD H., *Notts, Newark*
Post Office, Gratuities to Postmen *May* 13, 372
Rating Assessment *May* 13, 371

FINLAY, SIR ROBERT B. (Solicitor General), *Inverness Burghs*
Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 229

Fisheries Acts Amendment Bill
l. Pres., Earl of Dudley ; Read 1ª *May* 14, 464

FITZGERALD, Sir R. U. PENROSE, Bart., *Cambridge*
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1056

FLANNERY, Mr. J. FORTESCUE, *Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley*
Mercantile Marine, Foreign Officers and Engineers *May* 18, 724

FLAVIN, Mr. M. J., *Kerry, N.*
Army Regulations, St. Patrick's Day *May* 28, 1521
Ballybunion (Kerry)
Bonâ-fide Travellers *May* 11, 196
Cashen River
Overflowing *May* 13, 377
Salmon Fishing *May* 25, 1256
Castleblaney Petty Sessions *May* 27, 1427
Cork and Tralee Prisons *May* 14, 498
Education Centre Superintendents, Ireland *May* 20, 912
Irish
Fisheries *May* 27, 1413
Mail Service *May* 28, 1513
Kerry
Ballybunion (see above)
Estates, Receivers *May* 21, 1024
Grand Jury *May* 21, 1026, 1027
Police Force *May* 27, 1414, 1415
Salleen Pier *May* 27, 1426
Land Commission, Ireland *May* 25, 1265
Light Railways, Ireland *May* 24, 1136
Listowel
Ormathwaite Property *May* 14, 498, 499
Potato Crop *May* 28, 1512
Maryborough Prison : Prisoner Thomas Collins *May* 10, 109 ; *May* 21, 1025, 1026 ; *May* 27, 1413
Naval Manœuvres *May* 28, 1521
Ormathwaite Property, Listowel *May* 14, 498, 499
Police Force, Kerry *May* 27, 1414, 1415
Post Office Establishments *May* 28, 1512
Potato Crop, Listowel *May* 28, 1512
Queen's Reign
Auxiliary Postmen *May* 28, 1508
Treason-felony Prisoners *May* 18, 725, 726 ; *May* 27, 1412
Veterans' Pensions *May* 28, 1510
River Feale Fishing *May* 24, 1130

[*cont.*

FLAVIN, Mr. M. J.—*cont.*
Salleen Pier, Kerry *May* 27, 1426
Salmon Fishing, Cashen River *May* 25, 1256
Supply : £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087
Voters' Lists, Westmeath *May* 27, 1424

Floods Prevention Bill
l. Pres., Lord Thring ; Read 1ª *May* 31, 1594

FLOWER, Mr. E., *Bradford, W.*
Navy, Personnel *May* 31, 1613

FLYNN, Mr. J. C., *Cork, N.*
Judiciary, Ireland *May* 21, 1038
Land Commission, Ireland *May* 17, 620
Supply
£68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 558
£40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland *May* 21, 1104
£3,880 for Public Record Office, Ireland *May* 21, 1105, 1107
£189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1557
Tokat Massacre *May* 21, 1036 ; *May* 25, 1257, 1258

FOREIGN OFFICE

Secretary of State—Marquess of SALISBURY
Under Secretary of State—Mr. G. N. CURZON

Armistice Turco-Greek War, *Qs.* Mr. C. P. Scott ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1039 ; *May* 24, 1143
Brussels Act, *Qs.* Sir J. H. Kennaway, Sir C. Dilke ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1034
Congo State, *Qs.* Sir C. Dilke ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 11, 193 ; *May* 18, 720
Crete, General, *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 13, 380 ; *May* 14, 508. *Q.* Mr. F. S. Stevenson ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 17, 626. *Q.* Mr. J. H. Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 20, 931. *Qs.* Mr. G. Lambert ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1142. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1270 ; *May* 31, 1636
Delagoa Bay, Arbitration Award, *Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1520
Dingley Tariff Bill (United States), *Q.* Major Jameson ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1268
Duty on Herrings, *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1136
Expulsion of Mr. Macpherson from Paris, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 11, 193
Foreign Consular Corps, Queen's Reign, *Q.* Mr. H. S. Foster ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1127
Fugitive Slaves, Zanzibar, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1025. *Qs.* Sir J. H. Kennaway, Sir C. Dilke ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516

[*cont.*

FOREIGN OFFICE—cont.
- *Greece and the Powers*, *Q.* Earl of Kimberley; *A.* Marquess of Salisbury *May* 10, 85. *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 11, 201
- *Kassala*, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 20, 915
- *Liquor Traffic in Africa*, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 31, 1608
- *Massacre, Tokat*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1036; *May* 25, 1257
- *Murder of Yusaf Yunan*, *Qs.* Mr. F. S. Stevenson; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 31, 1617
- *Queen's Reign, Foreign Consular Corps*, *Q.* Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1127
- *Raiatea, Disturbances*, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 10, 103
- *Royal Niger Company*, *Q.* Lord Stanmore; [*Obs.* Earl of Kimberley;] *A.* Marquess of Salisbury *May* 24, 1109
- *Scotch Herrings at St. Petersburg*, *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 13, 380
- *Slavery in Zanzibar*, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 14, 506
- *Tokat Massacre*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1036; *May* 25, 1257
- *Trawling, Moray Firth*, *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1256
- *Turco-Greek War*
  - *Armistice*, *Qs.* Mr. C. P. Scott; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1039; *May* 24, 1143
  - *Miscellaneous*, *Q.* General McCalmont; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 10, 100. *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 119; *May* 13, 393. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 20, 926
- *Uganda Railway*, *Q.* Mr. R. W. Perks; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 27, 1430
- *Yusaf Yunan, Murder of*, *Qs.* Mr. F. S. Stevenson; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 31, 1617
- *Zanzibar*
  - *British Officers*, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516
  - *Fugitive Slaves*, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 21, 1025. *Qs.* Sir J. H. Kennaway, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 28, 1516
  - *Slavery in*, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 14, 506

Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill
- *c.* 2R., Mr. Ritchie, 395, 399, 401, 412, 419; Mr. E. Robertson, 399, 418, 419, 429; Mr. J. H. Dalziel, (*Amendt.*) 399, 401, 426; Mr. T. P. Whittaker, 404, 432, 433; Sir H. Vincent, 407, 415, 436, 439; Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, 411, 412; Mr. J. Burns, 413, 415, 431; Mr. W. C. Quilter, 416, 417; [Mr. Speaker, 417:] Mr. J. Chamberlain, 419, 423, 426, 429, 430, 431, 433, 439; Mr. T. H. Cochrane, 421; Mr. J. Samuel, 422; Mr. J. Bryce, 429, 430, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439; Mr. J. Lowther, 437, 438; Mr. S. Hoare, 442; Mr. W. Allan, 443; Mr. J. Lowles, 444; Sir J. T. Brunner, 445; (*Division*, 446) *May* 13
- Read 2° *May* 13, 447
- On Motion, That Bill be com. to Standing Com. on Trade, etc., Mr. J. Samuel, 712 *May* 17

FORWOOD, Right Hon. Sir A. B., Bart., *Lancashire, S.W., Ormskirk*
- Mercantile Marine, Foreign Officers and Engineers *May* 18, 724
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1162, 1172, In Com. 1189, 1193; *May* 25, 1289; *May* 31, 1678

FOSTER, Mr. H. S., *Suffolk, Lowestoft*
- Queen's Reign
  - Foreign Consular Corps *May* 24, 1127
  - Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1673

FOSTER, Sir B. WALTER, *Derby, Ilkeston*
- Administration of Oaths, Courts of Justice *May* 21, 1037
- Aldershot Camp Sewage Farm *May* 11, 196
- Colliery Accident, Polesworth *May* 25, 1255
- Housing of the Working Classes Act *May* 18, 722
- Water Supply, Urswick *May* 7, 8

FOWLER, Right Hon. Sir HENRY H., *Wolverhampton, E.*
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill *May* 10, 122, In Com. 131
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 973, 974, 975, 1010
- Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expenses *May* 11, 250, 252
- Local Government Electors *May* 25, 1267
- Post Office Establishments *May* 7, 7, 8
- Supply: £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1551

GALLOWAY, Mr. W. J., *Manchester, S.W.*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1186, 1209; *May* 25, 1311, 1325; *May* 26, 1385; *May* 27, 1435, 1447, 1466, 1467, 1468

GEDGE, Mr. SYDNEY, *Walsall*
- Business of the House
  - General *May* 10, 115
  - Morning Sittings on Tuesday *May* 10, 120
- Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 906
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1362

GEORGE, Mr. D. LLOYD- (see LLOYD-GEORGE)

GILES, Mr. C. T., *Cambridge, Wisbech*
- Cattle Food, Imported *May* 31, 1631
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1675

GILHOOLY, Mr. JAMES, *Cork, W.*
- Land Commission, Ireland *May* 31, 1604

GODDARD, Mr. D. F., *Ipswich*
- Juvenile Offenders *May* 18, 720

GORST, RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN E. (Vice President of the Council), *Cambridge University*
- Antiquities, Ireland *May* 27, 1410; *May* 28, 1519
- College of Science, Dublin *May* 28, 1520
- Education
  - Department
    - England *May* 7, 11
    - Examiners *May* 11, 191
  - Secondary *May* 24, 1133
  - Technical *May* 14, 502
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill *May* 7, 6; In Com. *May* 10, 123, 124, 125, 132, 138, 151; 3R. *May* 20, 948
- Honiton
  - Elementary School, Holy Week *May* 14, 498
  - National Schools *May* 20, 916
- Irish Antiquities *May* 27, 1410; *May* 28, 1519
- Llanbedr School Board *May* 31, 1623
- Llangollen School Board *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1633
- North Mundham School Board *May* 24, 1129
- Queen's Reign
  - School
    - Attendances *May* 20, 914
    - Examinations *May* 21, 1030
    - Holidays *May* 14, 495
- Royal Irish Academy *May* 10, 105, 106
- School Boards
  - Divisions, London *May* 24, 1128
  - Llanbedr *May* 31 1623
  - Llangollen *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1633
  - Loans *May* 20, 916
  - North Mundham *May* 24, 1129
- School Boards Expenses Bill, Intro. *May* 17, 635
- Science and Art
  - Classes, Ireland *May* 21, 1036
  - Schools, Grants *May* 13, 367
- Secondary Education *May* 24, 1133
- Technical Education *May* 14, 502
- Voluntary Schools Act *May* 7, 6; *May* 10, 92; *May* 13, 373

GOSCHEN, RIGHT HON. GEORGE J. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *St. George's, Hanover Square*
- Artillery Practice, Plymouth Sound *May* 27, 1419
- Naval Manœuvres *May* 28, 1521
- Navy
  - Personnel *May* 31, 1613
  - Pulmonary Diseases *May* 7, 14
- Queen's Reign
  - Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9
  - Naval Review *May* 28, 1508; *May* 31, 1615
  - Royal Naval Reserve *May* 28, 1510
- Royal
  - Marines, Reserve *May* 14, 507
  - Naval Reserve
    - Queen's Reign *May* 28, 1510
    - Stornoway *May* 31, 1609

GOULDING, MR. E. A., *Wilts, Devizes*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 766; In Com. *May* 31, 1653

GRAY, MR. ERNEST, *West Ham, N.*
- East London Water Bill *May* 13, 353, 360
- Education, Half-time Scholars *May* 10, 92
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill *May* 7, 6; In Com. *May* 10, 123, 124, 128, 150; 3R. *May* 20, 951
- Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 215
- Voluntary Schools Act *May* 7, 5; *May* 13, 373

GREENE, MR. H. D., *Shrewsbury*
- Judge Advocate General's Department *May* 31 1635

GRICE-HUTCHINSON, CAPTAIN G. W., *Aston Manor*
- Army Reserve *May* 25, 1258

GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN, MR. A. S. T., *Kent, Tunbridge*
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 140

Griffith's Valuation (Ireland)
- Viscount Clifden, (*Personal Statement*) *May* 24 1116

Ground Game Act (Extension to Copyholders) Bill
- c. Intro., Mr. F. A. Channing; Read 1° *May* 18, 734

HALDANE, MR. R. B., *Haddington*
- Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 347
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1158, In Com. 1205; *May* 25, 1306, 1329, 1342; *May* 26, 1368; *May* 27, 1436 1469

HALSBURY, LORD (Lord Chancellor)
- Church Patronage Transfers Bill, 2R. *May* 14, 465
- Conveyancing Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 327
- Copyright Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 31, 1601
- Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 461, 464
- Juries Detention Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 87

HAMILTON, RIGHT HON. LORD GEORGE F. (Secretary of State for India), *Middlesex, Ealing*
- Black Watch Regiment, Subathu *May* 25 1252
- Board of Revenue, Madras *May* 31, 1607
- British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 503
- Chitral Medal *May* 17, 629
- Compensation Allowances, European and Indian Officials *May* 20, 935
- India
  - Ancient Monuments *May* 13, 383
  - Army Staff Appointments *May* 27, 1429; *May* 31, 1619, 1620
  - Civil Uncovenanted Service *May* 14, 508

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord GEORGE F.—*cont.*
- India—*cont.*
  - Exchange Compensation *May* 13, 361, 362
  - Expenditure *May* 20, 936
  - Salt Duty *May* 13, 384
- Indian
  - Midland and Bengal-Nagpur Railways *May* 20, 925
  - Police *May* 31, 1627
  - Staff Corps *May* 27, 1422
- Jhalawar *May* 27, 1428
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 31, 1615
- Radhanpur, State Property *May* 10, 111

HAMMOND, Mr. JOHN, *Carlow*
- Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Act 1895 *May* 14, 503

HANBURY, RIGHT HON. R. W. (Financial Secretary to the Treasury), *Preston*
- Agricultural Rating Act, Ireland *May* 24, 1142
- Argentine Cattle Trade *May* 24, 1132
- Artisans' Dwellings, London *May* 31, 1610
- Ballinamore Canal *May* 20, 908, 909; *May* 27, 1408
- Blackrock Township Commissioners *May* 10, 115; *May* 13, 387
- Business of the House
  - General *May* 13, 449
  - Supply: Civil Service Votes *May* 20, 939
- Carna Postal Deliveries *May* 10, 100
- Cavan Postal Facilities *May* 27, 1405
- Civil Service
  - Second Division Clerks *May* 17, 622
  - Temporary Men Copyists *May* 28, 1513
- Commissioners of Public Works, Ireland *May* 13, 366
- Cork Postmen *May* 13, 389
- Custom House, London *May* 24, 1135
- Delivery of Letters
  - Ireland *May* 17, 629
  - United Kingdom *May* 13, 370
- Dog Licences
  - Drumlithie (Kincardineshire) *May* 14, 501
  - Govan *May* 21, 1026
- Dundalk Post Office *May* 20, 929
- Dungeness Telegraph Office *May* 13, 378
- Edinburgh University *May* 25, 1263
- Education
  - Department, Junior Examiners *May* 31, 1612
  - Offices, Dublin *May* 21, 1027
- Female Post Office Clerks *May* 10, 98
- Glasgow Telephone Service *May* 20, 928
- Glebe Act, Ireland *May* 24, 1147; *May* 27, 1424
- Indian and Australian Mails *May* 18, 731
- Irish
  - Chronicles and Memorials *May* 28, 1515
  - Mail Service *May* 10, 97; *May* 11, 194, 195; *May* 14, 496, 497; *May* 17, 625; *May* 24, 1144, 1145; *May* 25, 1265; *May* 28, 1513; *May* 31, 1625

[*cont.*

HANBURY, Right Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
- Letters
  - Delivery of
    - Ireland *May* 17, 629
    - United Kingdom *May* 13, 370
  - H.M.'s Ships, for *May* 17, 615
  - Official Postmarks *May* 17, 627
- Lewis
  - Postal Facilities *May* 10, 91
  - Post Office *May* 11, 190; *May* 20, 909
- Local Loan Fund *May* 21, 1023
- Londonderry Lunatic Asylum *May* 24, 1137
- Loughshinny Pier, Dublin *May* 13, 387
- Mails
  - Indian and Australian *May* 18, 731
  - Irish *May* 10, 97; *May* 11, 194, 195; *May* 14, 496, 497; *May* 17, 625; *May* 24, 1144, 1145; *May* 25, 1265; *May* 28, 1513; *May* 31, 1625
- Official Postmarks on Letters *May* 17, 627
- Oldham Telegrams *May* 18, 727
- Parcel Post *May* 21, 1032
- Parish Councils, Scotland *May* 13, 368
- Parliamentary
  - Correspondence, Postage *May* 13, 365
  - Voters' Lists, Revision *May* 14, 509
- Piers, Loughshinny (Dublin) *May* 13, 387
- Pneumatic Messages *May* 31, 1624, 1625
- Postal
  - Deliveries
    - Carna *May* 10, 100
    - Circulars *May* 27, 1430
    - Ireland *May* 14, 499
  - Facilities
    - Cavan *May* 27, 1405
    - Lewis *May* 10, 91
  - Orders *May* 28, 1515
  - Telegraph Offices *May* 25, 1264
- Post Cards *May* 17, 627
- Postmen
  - Auxiliary, Queen's Reign *May* 28, 1508
  - Cork *May* 13, 389
  - Gratuities to *May* 13, 372
  - Rural
    - Dismissal *May* 28, 1522
    - Ireland *May* 24, 1141
- Post Offices
  - Adult Messengers *May* 31, 1609
  - Delivery of Letters
    - Ireland *May* 17, 629
    - United Kingdom *May* 13, 370
  - Dundalk *May* 20, 929
  - Establishments *May* 7, 7; *May* 17, 631; *May* 18, 731; *May* 20, 912; *May* 28, 1512
  - Female Clerks *May* 10, 98
  - Gratuities to Postmen *May* 13, 372
  - Guide *May* 25, 1253
  - Lewis *May* 11, 190; *May* 20, 909
  - Overtime *May* 31, 1630
  - Prosecution *May* 25, 1259
  - Savings Bank *May* 13, 368; *May* 20, 923; *May* 25, 1253
- Post Office (Sites) Bill, Intro. *May* 13, 395
- Queen's Reign
  - Adverse Records *May* 17, 630
  - Auxiliary Postmen *May* 28, 1508
  - Closing Telegraph Offices *May* 13, 374
  - Jubilee Day *May* 27, 1412
- Rural Postmen
  - Dismissal *May* 28, 1522
  - Ireland *May* 24, 1141

[*cont.*

Hanbury, Right Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
- Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Act, 1895 *May* 14, 503, 504
- Stamp
  - Duty, Ireland *May* 17, 525
  - Illustrations *May* 20, 910
- Stationery Office *May* 28, 1511
- Supply
  - £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 71, 74, 77
  - £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 80, 82, 83
  - £189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1559
  - £132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1525, 1530, 1531, 1533
- Telegrams
  - Non-delivery *May* 17, 618
  - Oldham *May* 18, 727
- Telegraph
  - Addresses *May* 13, 370
  - Charges *May* 13, 371 ; *May* 21, 1033
  - Offices
    - Balcarra (Mayo) *May* 20, 919
    - Closing, Queen's Reign *May* 13, 374
    - Dungeness *May* 13, 378
    - Number of *May* 25, 1264
    - Public Guarantee *May* 10, 107 ; *May* 13, 370
  - Posts, Yeovil *May* 13, 379
- Telephone
  - Service, Glasgow *May* 20, 928
  - System, Peterborough *May* 31, 1605
- Tuskar Light, Telephonic Communication *May* 10, 93
- Upper Division Clerks, Charity Commission *May* 11, 191
- Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore Railway *May* 7, 11 ; *May* 13, 378 ; *May* 20, 939
- Yeovil Telegraph Posts *May* 13, 379

Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W. Vernon, *Monmouthshire, W.*
- Business of the House
  - General *May* 17, 632 ; *May* 31, 1637
  - Supply : Colonial Office Vote *May* 18, 733
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 973, 994, 995, 996, 998, 1002, 1008

Hardy, Mr. Laurence, *Kent, Ashford*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1318, 1327

Harrington, Mr. T., *Dublin, Harbour*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 283

Harrison, Mr. Charles, *Plymouth*
- Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expense *May* 11, 245
- Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 207
- Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Ground *May* 17, 616
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1302, 1305 ; *May* 31 1640, 1682, 1701

Hart Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W., Bart. (see Dyke)

Harwood, Mr. George, *Bolton*
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 963, 979

Haslett, Sir James H., *Belfast, N.*
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1057
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 297

Hazell, Mr. Walter, *Leicester*
- Midwives Registration Act *May* 13, 390
- Supply : £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 80, 81

Healy, Mr. Maurice, *Cork City*
- Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill, In Com. *May* 11, 235, 236
- Business of the House, General *May* 13, 449
- Estates Return, Ireland *May* 13, 384
- Irish
  - Acts, Codification *May* 13, 384, 385
  - Mail Service *May* 14, 497
- Land Commission, Ireland *May* 17, 621 ; *May* 20, 926
- Married Women (Ireland) Bill, Intro. *May* 19, 872
- Parliamentary Voters' Lists, Revision *May* 14, 508
- Postmen, Cork *May* 13, 388
- Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 228
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 286, 294
- Supply : £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 549, 562, 569
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill, Intro. *May* 14, 512

Healy, Mr. Timothy M., *Louth, N.*
- Cape Garrison *May* 14, 492, 493, 494
- Land Commission, Ireland *May* 17, 621
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1050
- Lough Mask and Ballinrobe Canal *May* 14, 494
- Model Schools, Ireland *May* 7, 3
- Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill *May* 7, 17
- Post Office, Dundalk *May* 20, 929
- Supply
  - £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 513, 514, 515, 523, 524, 530, 531, 533, 540, 550, 551, 553, 557
  - £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1061

Heaton, Mr. J. Henniker, *Canterbury*
- Business of the House, General *May* 25, 1272
- Delagoa Bay Arbitration Award *May* 28, 1520
- Letters, Official Postmarks *May* 17, 627
- Parcel Post *May* 21, 1032
- Post Cards *May* 17, 627
- Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 225
- Stamp Illustrations *May* 20, 910
- Telegraph
  - Addresses *May* 13, 370
  - Charges *May* 13, 371 ; *May* 21, 1033

HEDDERWICK, Mr. T. C. H., *Wick Burghs*
- Prison System, Scotland *May* 10, 106 ; *May* 24, 1127
- Private Bill Legislation, Scotland *May* 13, 391

HELDER, Mr. AUGUSTUS, *Whitehaven*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 676

HEMPHILL, Right Hon. Serjeant C. H., *Tyrone, N.*
- Irish Chronicles and Memorials *May* 28, 1514
- Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1082, 1083

HERMON-HODGE, Mr. R. T., *Oxon, Henley*
- Parish Councils Association *May* 25, 1253, 1254

HERSCHELL, Lord
- Church Patronage Transfers Bill, 2R. *May* 14, 465
- Copyright Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 31, 1599
- Juries Detention Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 88
- Municipal Franchise, Ireland *May* 20, 893
- Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 892

HICKMAN, Sir A., *Wolverhampton, W.*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 777 ; In Com. *May* 25, 1325 ; *May* 26, 1355

HICKS-BEACH, Sir MICHAEL E., Bart. (see BEACH)

Highgate Woods Preservation Bill
- *c.* Intro., Mr. H. C. Stephens ; Read 1° *May* 18, 718

HILL, Colonel Sir E. S., *Bristol, S.*
- Red Sea, Lighting *May* 10, 99
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 665 ; *May* 24, 1162 ; In Com. *May* 31, 1680

HOARE, Mr. SAMUEL, *Norwich*
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 442

HOBHOUSE, Mr. H., *Somerset, E.*
- Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 243
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 258
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1672

HOGAN, Mr. J. F., *Tipperary, Mid*
- Army
  - Horses *May* 10, 104
  - Remounts *May* 18, 729

[*cont.*

HOGAN, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
- British
  - Museum *May* 31, 1636
  - Zukon Chartered Company *May* 31, 1631
- Canadian
  - Fast Atlantic Service *May* 25, 1267
  - Mail Service *May* 31, 1619
- Covent Garden Theatre Fund *May* 18, 729 ; *May* 31, 1603
- Manitoba
  - Colonisation Board *May* 25, 1261
  - Crofters' Settlements *May* 18, 730
- Queensland *May* 10, 112 ; *May* 25, 1256
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 10, 95 ; *May* 25, 1261
- Raiatea, Disturbances *May* 10, 103

HOLBURN, Mr. J. G., *Lanark, N.W.*
- Queen's Reign, Poor Laws *May* 28, 1508

HOLLAND, Hon. L. R., *Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley*
- Military Prisons *May* 31, 1621
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 737 ; In Com. *May* 27, 1476 1477

HOME DEPARTMENT

Secretary of State—Sir M. W. RIDLEY
Under Secretary of State—Mr. JESSE COLLINGS

- *Amnesty to Irish Prisoners, Queen's Reign,* *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin ; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field ; [Mr. Speaker ;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
- *Boiler Explosions Acts, Q.* Sir W. H. Houldsworth ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 17, 623
- *Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum : Hewson (Isabella), Q.* Sir H. S. King ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1421
- *Burial, Premature, Qs.* Mr. J. C. Macdona ; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1139
- *Burnley, Discharge of Weavers, Q.* Mr. P. J. Stanhope ; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 500
- *Cleaning Machinery in Motion, Q.* Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 28, 1506
- *Colliery Accident, Polesworth, Q.* Sir B. W. Foster ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1255
- *Cruelty to Animals, London, Qs.* Captain Donelan ; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1410
- *Discharge of Weavers, Burnley, Q.* Mr. P. J. Stanhope ; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 500
- *Factory and Workshops Act 1895, Dock and Wharf Machinery, Q.* Mr. Sydney Buxton ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266

[*cont.*

HOME DEPARTMENT—cont.

Gambling Raid, Hull, Q. Sir H. S. King; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 13, 381

Gipsies, Qs. Mr. T. Skewes-Cox, Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 732

Hull, Gambling Raid, Q. Sir H. S. King; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 13, 381

Italian Ice-cream Vendors, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1028

Juvenile Offenders, Q. Mr. D. F. Goddard; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 720

Laundry Workers, Q. Mr. D. Lloyd-George; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 507

Lead Poisoning, Q. Mr. R. McKenna; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1134

Local Government Electors, Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1267

Metropolitan Police

Adverse Records, Queen's Reign, Q. Mr. J. Lowles; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 17, 629

Extra Allowance to, Queen's Reign, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1029. *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412

Metropolitan Police Courts Bill, Qs. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *As.* Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir M. Hicks Beach, Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 7, 14

Mines and Quarries, Statistics, Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 11, 197

Mining Accident, Durham, Q. Mr. C. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 7, 18

Paris Fire, Safety of Public Buildings, Qs. Mr. J. Aird, Mr. T. G. Fardell; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 10, 95

Performing Bears, Streets, Q. Colonel Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 506

Prison

Clerks, Q. Mr. H. C. F. Luttrell; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 718

Reading, Discharge of Warder, Qs. Mr. M. Davitt; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420

Probation of First Offenders Act, Q. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1033

Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee (see that Title)

Reading Prison, Discharge of Warder, Qs. Mr. M. Davitt; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420

Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment Bill, Qs. Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 27, 1431

Treason-felony Prisoners, Queen's Reign, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510

Truck Act 1896, Qs. Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1128

Warder, Reading Prison, Discharge of, Qs. Mr. M. Davitt; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420

Weavers, Burnley, Discharge of, Q. Mr. P. J. Stanhope; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 500

[*cont.*

HOME DEPARTMENT—cont.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 10, 107. *Qs.* Mr. H. Broadhurst, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley, Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 623. *Qs.* Mr. H. Seton-Karr, Mr. J. Ellis; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 932. *Qs.* Mr. H. Seton-Karr; *As.* Sir R. Webster *May* 27, 1432
(For Debates see Title of Bill)

Workmen (Compensation Insurance) Bill, Belgium, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 729

HOPETOUN, Earl of

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment Bill *May* 10, 88

HOPKINSON, Mr. A., *Wilts, Cricklade*

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill In Com. *May* 25, 1295; *May* 26, 1380

HOULDSWORTH, Sir W. H., Bart., *Manchester, N.W.*

Boards of Guardians, Public Bills *May* 17, 628

Boiler Explosions Acts *May* 17, 623

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 680

HOWELL, Mr. W. T., *Denbigh Boroughs*

Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 851, 854

Telegraph Offices, Public Guarantee *May* 10 107

HOZIER, Mr. J. H. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*

Cavalry Recruits *May* 24, 1132

Scots Greys *May* 7, 5

HUDSON, Mr. G. B., *Herts, Hitchin*

Postal Orders *May* 28, 1515

HUMPHREYS-OWEN, Mr. ARTHUR C., *Montgomery*

Berriew School Scheme *May* 31, 1621

Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 857, 862

Supply: £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1555

HUTTON, Mr. JOHN, *Yorkshire, N.R., Richmond*

Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 941

INCHIQUIN, LORD

Land Legislation, Ireland *May* 25, 1241

Incorporated Law Society (Judicial Duties, Expense)

Mr. C. Harrison, (*Motion*) 245; Mr. W. Ambrose 246; Mr. T. Bucknill, 246; Mr. J. W. Mellor, 247; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 247, 250; Sir H. Fowler, 250, 252; Sir E. Clarke, 251; Sir M. Hicks Beach, 254; (*Division*, 256) *May* 11

INDIA

Secretary of State—Lord G. HAMILTON
Under Secretary of State—Earl of ONSLOW

Ancient Monuments, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 13, 383
Army Staff
- *Appointments*, Q. Captain Pirie; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 27, 1428
- *Officers*, Qs. Colonel Wyndham Murray, Captain Pirie; As. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1619

Black Watch Regiment, Subathu, Q. Colonel Wyndham Murray; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 25, 1251
Board of Revenue, Madras, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1606
British Troops in India (Health), Q. Mr. Stuart-Wortley; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 14, 502
(For Debates see that Title)
Chitral Medal, Q. Mr. T. R. Buchanan; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 17, 629
Civil (Uncovenanted) Service, Q. Mr. F. G. Barnes; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 14, 507
Compensation Allowance, European and Indian Officials, Qs. Sir W. Wedderburn; As. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Lord G. Hamilton *May* 20, 934
Crimean and Indian Veterans, Queen's Reign, Q. Captain Norton; A. Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413
East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill (see that Title)
Exchange Compensation, Qs. Sir H. S. King, Sir W. Wedderburn; As. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 13, 361
Expenditure, India, Q. Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 20, 936
Indian
- *Midland and Bengal-Nagpur Railways*, Q. Mr. J. Dillon; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 20, 924
- *Police*, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31 1627
- *Services, Seats, Queen's Reign*, Q. Sir H. S. King; A Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 914. Q. Captain Norton; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1615
- *Staff Corps*, Q. Sir H. S. King; A. Lord G. Hamilton; *May* 27, 1421

Jhalawar, Qs. Mr. W. Jones, Mr. J. P. Smith; As. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 27, 1427
Madras, Board of Revenue, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1606
Mails, Indian and Australian, Q. Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; A. Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 730
Officers, Army Staff, Qs. Colonel Wyndham Murray, Captain Pirie; As. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1619
Police, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1627
Queen's Reign
- *Crimean and Indian Veterans*, Q. Captain Norton; A. Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413

INDIA—cont.
Queen's Reign—cont.
- *Indian Services, Seats*, Q. Sir H. S. King; A. Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 914. Q. Captain Norton; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1615
  (See also Title QUEEN'S REIGN, DIAMOND JUBILEE)

Radhanpur, State Property, Q. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 10, 110
Salt Duty, Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; A. Lord G. Hamilton *May* 13, 384

Industries (Ireland) Bill

c. In Com., Rep. *May* 13, 451
Considered as Amended *May* 14, 580
Read 3° and Passed *May* 14, 580
l. Read 1ª *May* 17, 581
2R., Earl of Mayo, 1234, 1240; Earl of Arran, 1235; Earl of Denbigh, 1235; Earl of Morley, 1236; Earl of Wemyss, 1239; Marquess of Salisbury, 1239 *May* 25
Withdrawn *May* 25, 1240

Infant Life Protection Bill

l. In Com., Lord Belper, (*Amendts.*) 315, (*Amendt.*) 323; (*Amendts. Agreed to*, 317); Earl of Denbigh, 316, 318, [*New Clause*] 321, 324; [*Clause ordered to stand part of Bill*, 321]; (*Amendt. Agreed to*, 324) *May* 13
Re-committed to Standing Com. *May* 13, 325
Rep. with further Amendts. *May* 18, 717
Amendts. Rep.; Earl of Denbigh, [*New Clause*] 1020; [*Clause Added*, 1021] *May* 21
Read 3ª; Amendts. made and Passed *May* 24, 1114

Insanity (see LUNACY)

IRELAND

Lord Lieutenant—Earl CADOGAN
Chief Secretary—Mr. G. W. BALFOUR
Lord Chancellor—Lord ASHBOURNE
Attorney General—Mr. J. ATKINSON
Solicitor General—Mr. W. KENNY

Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District, Castlebar Union, Q. Dr. Ambrose; A. Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1146
Agricultural Rating Act (Ireland), Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. T. Lough; As. Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1024. Q. Mr. W. Field; A. Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1142
Agriculture and Industries (Ireland) Bill, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 501
Amnesty to Treason-felony Prisoners, Queen's Reign, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; As. Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. Q. Mr. J. Daly; A. Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
Annaly Estate, Longford, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1507
Antiquities, Q. Captain Donelan; A. Sir J. Gorst *May* 27, 1410. Q. Mr. W. E. H. Lecky; A. Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1519
Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill (see that Title)

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

- *Ardagh (Longford) Burial Ground, Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 198
- *Ard West Pier, Carna, Connemara, Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 99
- *Army*
  - *Food and Forage Supplies, Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1625
  - *Regulations, St. Patrick's Day, Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill, Captain Donelan; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 10, 100
- *Balbriggan Harbour, Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 388
- *Ballinamore Canal, Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 908. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1407
- *Ballybunion (Kerry)*
  - *Bonâ-fide Travellers, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 196
  - *Cashen River*
    - *Overflowing, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 377
    - *Salmon Fishing, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
- *Bankruptcy Court, Q.* Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1034
- *Blackrock Township Commissioners, Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 114. *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 386
- *Bonâ-fide Travellers, Ballybunion (Kerry), Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 196
- *Brookeborough Petty Sessions, Qs.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497
- *Canals*
  - *Ballinamore, Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 908. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1407
  - *Inquiry, Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 723
  - *Longford Harbour, Q* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726; *May* 28, 1514
  - *Lough Mask and Ballinrobe, Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 494
- *Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 106
- *Carna, Connemara*
  - *Ard West Pier, Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 99
  - *Postal Delivery, Sunday, Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 100
- *Carrickfergus, High Sheriff, Q.* Mr. R. M Dane; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
- *Cashen River*
  - *Overflowing, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 377
  - *Salmon Fishing, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
- *Castlebar Union, Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District, Q.* Dr. R. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1146

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

- *Castleblaney*
  - *Land Commission, Sligo and, Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 12
  - *Petty Sessions, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1427
- *Cavan*
  - *Distress Relief Works, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1517
  - *Postal Facilities, Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1404
  - *Royal Irish Constabulary, Tullyvin, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 195
- *Charges*
  - *Larceny, Tyrone, Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1422
  - *Murder*
    - *Omagh, Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 921
    - *Tyrone, Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 728
  - *Robbery, Tyrone, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1143
- *Collection of Rates, Dublin, Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 113
- *College of Science, Dublin, Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
- *Commissioners of Public Works, Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 366
- *Constabulary, Royal Irish* (see *Royal Irish Constabulary* below)
- *Cork*
  - *Labourers' Cottages, Midleton Guardians, Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 623
  - *Postmen, Q.* Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 388
  - *Tralee, and, Prisons, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498
  - *Wreck of S.S. Memphis, Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 13
- *Deportation of Paupers, Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 374. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 14, 509; *May* 17, 631
- *Derry, Eviction, Durnascallon, Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
- *Dingley Tariff Bill (United States), Q.* Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1268
- *Distress Relief Works, Cavan, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1517
- *Drainage Works, Qs.* Mr. J. Tully, Mr. P. C. Doogan; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 27, 1431
- *Dublin*
  - *Collection of Rates, Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 113
  - *College of Science, Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
  - *Education Office, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1027

[*cont.*

- *IRELAND*—cont.
  - *Dublin*—cont.
    - *Loughshinny Pier*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 387
    - *Veterinary College*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 386
  - *Dublin Corporation Bill* (see that Title)
  - *Dundalk Post Office*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 929
  - *Dungarvan and Lismore Railway*, *Q.* Mr. P. J. Power; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 939
  - *Education*
    - *Centre Superintendents*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 912
    - *Office, Dublin*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1027
    - *Technical*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1023
  - *Epidemic, Irish Schools*, *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
  - *Equity Sessions, Strabane*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 10
  - *Estates*
    - *Annaly, Longford*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1507
    - *Fermanagh School*, *Q.* Mr. P. C. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
    - *Kerry, Receivers*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1024
    - *Littledale, Wicklow, Eviction*, *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613
    - *Return*, *Q.* Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 384
    - *Shirley and Tennison, Monaghan*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
  - *Evictions*
    - *Durnascallon (Derry)*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
    - *Littledale Estate, Wicklow*, *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613
    - *Longford*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
  - *Fermanagh*
    - *Petty Sessions, Letterbreen*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
    - *School Estate*, *Q.* Mr. P. C. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
  - *Fisheries*
    - *Irish*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413
    - *Sea*, *Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 930
  - *Fishery Inquiry, Listowel*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1633
  - *Fishing*
    - *River Feale*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1130
    - *Salmon, River Cashen*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
  - *Franchise Acts 1885*, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1261
  - *Glebe Act (Ireland)*, *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1146; *May* 27, 1423

[*cont.*

- *IRELAND*—cont.
  - *Granard*
    - *Police Arrangements*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 98
    - *Union*, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G Balfour *May* 31, 1628
  - *Grand Jury*
    - *Accounts, Monaghan*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
    - *Kerry*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1026
    - *System*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 723
  - *Great Northern Railway Company of*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 12
  - *Griffith's Valuation* (see that Title)
  - *Gun and Game Licences*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1630
  - *Harbours*
    - *Balbriggan*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 388
    - *Longford Canal*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726; *May* 28, 1514
  - *High Sheriff, Carrickfergus*, *Q.* Mr. R. M. Dane; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
  - *Industrial Schools*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1258
  - *Irish*
    - *Acts, Codification*, *Qs.* Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 384
    - *Antiquities*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 27, 1410. *Q.* Mr. W. E. H. Lecky; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1519
    - *Chronicles and Memorials*, *Q.* Mr. Serjeant Hemphill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1514
    - *Schools, Epidemic Disease*, *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
  - *Judiciary*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Flynn, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 21, 1038
  - *Jurors Challenged, Tyrone*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1616
  - *Kerry*
    - *Ballybunion*
      - *Bonâ-fide Travellers*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 196
      - *Cashen River*
        - *Overflowing*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 377
        - *Salmon Fishing*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
    - *Estates, Receivers*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1024
    - *Grand Jury*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1026
    - *Police Force*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. D. Kilbride; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1414
    - *Salleen Pier*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1426
    - *Sneem Pier*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
  - *Labourers' Cottages*
    - *Ireland*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 623. *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 917
    - *Meath*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 114

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.
- *Labourers' Cottages*—cont.
  - *Midleton (Cork) Guardians*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 623
  - *Strabane*, *Q.* Mr. A. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1623
- *Labourers (Ireland) Acts*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1408
- *Land*
  - *Commission*
    - *Carrickmacross and Ballybay*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192
    - *Castleblaney and Sligo*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 12
    - *Ireland*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. C. Flynn, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 620. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 925. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1265. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Captain Donelan, Mr. J. Gilhooly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1603
  - *Commissioners*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 364
  - *Rating*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. T. Lough, Mr. Vesey Knox; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 936
  - *Sub-Commissions*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. S. Young; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 363. *Q.* Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 509
  - *Valuation, Ireland*, *Qs.* Viscount Clifden, Earl Spencer; *As.* Earl of Denbigh *May* 13, 338
- *Land Law (Ireland) Act 1887*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1265
- *Land Law (Ireland) Acts, Royal Commission*, *Q.* Viscount Templetown; [*Obs.* Earl of Mayo;] *A.* Earl of Denbigh *May* 20, 896. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 24, 1148
- *Land Legislation (Ireland)* (see that Title)
- *Larceny, Charge of, Tyrone*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1422
- *Leitrim, Burial Ground, Mohill*, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 928
- *Letterbreen Petty Sessions*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
- *Licences*
  - *Gun and Game*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1630
  - *Publican's, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 923
- *Light Railways* (see Title RAILWAYS)
- *Limerick, Petty Sessions Fees*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
- *Listowel*
  - *Fishery Inquiry*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1633
  - *Ormathwaite Property*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498
  - *Potato Crop*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1512

IRELAND—cont.
- *Littledale Estate, Wicklow Eviction*, *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613
- *Loan Fund*
  - *Board*, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1518
  - *Societies*, *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. R. M. Dane; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 107
- *Local Government*
  - *Board Auditors, Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Parnell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1416
  - *Ireland*, *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1635
- *Local Government (Ireland) Ministerial Proposals*, (see that Title)
- *Londonderry Lunatic Asylum*, *Qs.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137
- *Longford*
  - *Annaly Estate*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1507
  - *Ardagh Burial Ground*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 198
  - *Canal Harbour*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726; *May* 28, 1514
  - *Eviction*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
  - *Union Workhouse*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1409
- *Lough*
  - *Mask and Ballinrobe Canal*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 494
  - *Neagh, Pollen Act*, *Qs.* Mr. P. C. Doogan, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 920
- *Loughshinny Pier, Dublin*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 387
- *Lunatic Asylum, Londonderry*, *Qs.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137
- *Macroom Guardians, Removal of Sick Paupers*, *Q.* Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 916.
- *Mail Service*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. D. Macaleese; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 97. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 194. *Qs.* Mr. W. O'Malley, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 496. *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. R. M. Dane; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 624. *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1144. *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1265. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1513. *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1625
- *Maryborough Prison, Thomas Collins*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 109. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1025. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

- *Mayo*
  - *Ordnance Survey*, *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 389. *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 17, 626
  - *Telegraph Office, Balcarra*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 919
- *Meath, Labourers' Cottages*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 114
- *Mersey Docks Bill*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1423
- *Model Schools*
  - *Inquiry*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
  - *Queen's Birthday*, *Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
- *Mohill Burial Ground, Leitrim*, *Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 928
- *Monaghan*
  - *Grand Jury Accounts*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
  - *Petty Sessions Courthouse, Newbliss*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
  - *Shirley and Tennison Estates*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
- *Monitors, National Schools*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
- *Mullingar Union*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Tully; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1031; *May* 27, 1424; *May* 28, 1518
- *Municipal Franchise, Ireland*, *Q.* Lord Herschell; [*Obs.* Lord Monteagle, Earl of Mayo;] *A.* Earl of Denbigh *May* 20, 893
- *Murder, Charge of*
  - *Omagh*, *Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 921
  - *Tyrone*, *Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 728
- *National Schools*
  - *Monitors*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
  - *Teachers' Fund*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 619
  - *Workmistresses*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137
- *Newbliss Petty Sessions Courthouse, Monaghan*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
- *Omagh, Charge of Murder*, *Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 921
- *Ordnance Survey, Mayo*, *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 389. *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 17, 626
- *Ormathwaite Property, Listowel*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498
- *Paupers*
  - *Deportation of*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 374. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 14, 509; *May* 17, 631
  - *Removal of Sick, Macroom Guardians*, *Q.* Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 916
- *Petty Sessions*
  - *Brookeborough*, *Qs.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497
  - *Castleblaney*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1427

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

- *Petty Sessions*—cont.
  - *Courthouse, Newbliss*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
  - *Fees, Limerick*, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
  - *Letterbreen*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
  - *Magisterial Jurisdiction*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1037
- *Piers*
  - *Ard West, Carna, Connemara*, *Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 99
  - *Dublin, Loughshinny*, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 387
  - *Kerry*
    - *Salleen*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1426
    - *Sneem*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
- *Police*
  - *Arrangements, Granard*, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 98
  - *Force, Kerry*, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. D. Kilbride; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1414
  - *Pensioners*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1269
- *Pollen Act, Lough Neagh*, *Qs.* Mr. P. C. Doogan, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 920
- *Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill*, *Qs.* Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 17. *Qs.* Mr. T. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 511. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1028
- *Portumna Railway*, *Qs.* Mr. W. Field, Mr. D. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
- *Postal*
  - *Delivery*
    - *Carna, Sunday*, *Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 100
    - *House to House*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 499
  - *Facilities, Cavan*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1404
- *Postmen*
  - *Cork*, *Q.* Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 388
  - *Rural*, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1141
- *Post Office, Dundalk*, *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 929
- *Potato Crops*
  - *Ireland*, *Qs.* Mr. P. McDermott, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
  - *Listowel District*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1512
- *Prisons*
  - *Cork and Tralee*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498
  - *Maryborough*, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 109. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1025. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

Private Bill Legislation, Ireland, Qs. Mr. J. L. Carew, Mr. J. J. Clancy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 93
Publican's Licence, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 923
Public Works Commissioners, Q. Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 366
Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill (see that Title)
Queen's
Birthday, Model Schools in, Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
Colleges, Qs. Mr. J. Pinkerton, Mr. W. Johnston; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 922
Queen's Reign
Royal Irish Constabulary, Q. Mr. J. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
Treason-felony Prisoners, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
Railways
Great Northern of, Company, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 12
Light (see under Title RAILWAYS)
Portumna, Qs. Mr. W. Field, Mr. D. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore, Qs. Mr. P. J. Power; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 7, 11; *May* 13, 378; *May* 20, 939
Rathkeale Union, Election of Guardian, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
Religious Orders, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1267
Revenue, Great Britain and Ireland, Q. Mr. J. Morley; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 13, 382
River Feale Fishing, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1130
Rivers
Cashen
Overflowing, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 377
Salmon Fishing, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
Feale, Fishing, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1130
Robbery, Charge of, Tyrone, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1143
Rooskey Bridge, Roscommon, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1139
Roscommon, Rooskey Bridge, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1139
Royal
College of Science, Dublin, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
Irish
Academy, Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 10, 105
Constabulary
Queen's Reign, Q. Mr. J. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
Tullyvin (Cavan), Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 195

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

Rural Postmen, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1141
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill (see that Title)
Salleen Pier, Kerry, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1426
Salmon Fishing, Cashen River, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
Schools
Attendances, Q. Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
Estate, Fermanagh, Q. Mr. P. C. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
Industrial, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1258
Irish, Epidemic, Q. Mr. J. L, Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
Model
Inquiry, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
Queen's Birthday, Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
National
Monitors, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
Teachers' Fund, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 619
Workmistresses, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137
Science
Classes, Art, and, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 21, 1036
Royal College of, Dublin, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1022. *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1145. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 28, 1520
Teachers, Q. Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1260
Sea Fisheries, Q. Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 930
Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Act 1895, Qs. Mr. J. Hammond; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 503
Sheriffs
High, Carrickfergus, Q. Mr. R. M Dane; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
Westmeath, Appointment of, Q. Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1628
Shirley and Tennison Estates, Monaghan, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
Shorthorn Bulls, Ireland, Q. Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1146
Sligo and Castleblaney, Land Commission, Qs. Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 12
Sneem Pier, Kerry, Qs. Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
Stamp Duty, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 625
Strabane
Equity Sessions, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 10
Labourer's Cottage, Q. Mr. A. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1623
Teachers
Fund, National School, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 619
Science, Q. Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1260

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

- *Technical Education*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1023
- *Telegraph Office, Balcarra (Mayo)*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 919
- *Telephonic Communication, Tuskar Light*, Q. Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 93. *Q.* Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1405
- *Treason-felony Prisoners*, Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 15. (See also *Queen's Reign* above)
- *Tuskar Light, Telephonic Communication*, Q. Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 93. *Q.* Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1405
- *Tyrone*
  - *Charge of*
    - *Larceny*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1422
    - *Murder*, Q. Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 728
    - *Robbery*, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1143
  - *Jurors Challenged*, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1616
- *Unions*
  - *Castlebar, Addergoole and Ballynagoraher District*, Q. Dr. R. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1146
  - *Granard*, Q. Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1628
  - *Mullingar*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Tully; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1031; *May* 27, 1424; *May* 28, 1518
  - *Rathkeale, Election of Guardian*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
  - *Workhouse, Longford*, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1409
- *Vehicles (Lights) Bill*, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 730 (For Debate see Title of Bill)
- *Veterinary College, Dublin*, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 386
- *Voters' List, Westmeath*, Q. Mr. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 25, 1270. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1424
- *Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore Railway*, Q. Mr. P. J. Power; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 7, 11; *May* 13, 378; *May* 20, 939
- *Westmeath*
  - *Sheriff, Appointment of*, Q. Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1628
  - *Voters' Lists*, Q. Mr. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 25, 1270. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1424
- *Wicklow, Eviction, Littledale Estate*, Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613
- *Workhouse, Longford Union*, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1409
- *Workmistresses, Irish National Schools*, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137
- *Wreck of S.S. Memphis*, Q. Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 13

ISAACSON, Mr. F. WOOTTON, *Tower Hamlets, Stepney*

- Queen's Reign, East End Procession *May* 13, 375

Isle of Man (Church Building Acts) Bill

- *c.* Read 1° *May* 17, 635

JAMESON, Major J. EUSTACE, *Clare, W.*

- Bankruptcy Court, Ireland *May* 21, 1034
- Dingley Tariff Bill, United States *May* 25, 1268
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 275

JEFFREYS, Mr. A. F., *Hants, Basingstoke*

- Lock Hospitals *May* 18, 719, 720
- Post Office, Delivery of Letters *May* 13, 370
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act *May* 13, 390
- Tithe Redemption Fees *May* 31, 1634
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 257
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1659

JENKINS, Sir J. J., *Carmarthen Boroughs*

- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1152

JOHNSTON, Mr. WILLIAM, *Belfast, S.*

- Business of the House, General *May* 10, 115
- Charge of Larceny, Tyrone *May* 27, 1422
- Committees, Ascension Day *May* 26, 1345, 1346
- Queen's
  - Birthday, Model Schools, Ireland *May* 20, 915
  - Colleges, Ireland *May* 20, 923
  - Reign, Thanksgiving Service *May* 13, 375; *May* 25, 1263
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 303

JOHNSTONE, Mr. J. HEYWOOD, *Sussex, Horsham*

- Joint Burial Committees *May* 14, 505

JOICEY, Sir JAMES, Bart., *Durham, Chester-le-Street*

- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 702; *May* 18, 767, 793, 794, 805; *May* 24, 1160, In Com. 1206; *May* 25, 1279, 1303, 1307; *May* 26, 1353, 1391; *May* 27, 1439, 1483, 1485

JONES, Mr. DAVID BRYNMOR, *Swansea District*

- Business of the House, General *May* 17, 634
- Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 821, 854
- University of London Bill *May* 17, 632

JONES, Mr. L. ATHERLEY-(see ATHERLEY-JONES)

JONES, Mr. W., *Carnarvon, Arfon*
Jhalawar *May* 27, 1427
Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 906

JORDAN, Mr. J., *Fermanagh, S.*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 272

Juries Detention Bill
l. 2R., Lord Coleridge, 86; Lord Russell of Killowen, 86; Lord Halsbury, 87; Lord Herschell, 88 *May* 10
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 10, 88
In Com., Rep. without Amendt. and re-com. to Standing Com. *May* 20, 893
Amendts. Rep., 1503; Lord Coleridge, 1503; Lord Ashbourne, 1503 *May* 28
Read 3ª with Amendts.; Passed and Returned to Commons *May* 31, 1602

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Right Hon. Sir UGHTRED, Bart., *Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 947

KEARLEY, Mr. H. E., *Devonport*
Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 165
Queen's Reign, Closing Telegraph Offices *May* 13, 374
Royal Patriotic Fund *May* 13, 376
Volunteers Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 1012
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 793; *May* 24, 1172

KELVIN, Lord
Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1495

KENNAWAY, Right Hon. Sir JOHN H., Bart., *Devonshire, Honiton*
Brussels Act *May* 21, 1034
Fugitive Slaves, Zanzibar Coast *May* 28, 1516
Powell *v.* Kempton Park Company *May* 31, 1634

KENYON-SLANEY, Colonel W., *Shropshire, Newport*
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 846

KILBRIDE, Mr. D., *Galway, N.*
Business of the House, General *May* 10, 184
Police Force, Kerry *May* 27, 1415
Portumna Railway *May* 27, 1415
Supply
  £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1584
  £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 571, 572
  £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1090, 1091
  £3,880 for Public Record Office, Ireland *May* 21, 1107

KIMBERLEY, Earl of
British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 606
Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 462
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1231; In Com. *May* 28, 1504
Greece and the Powers *May* 10, 85
Royal Niger Company *May* 24, 1113
Whitsuntide Recess *May* 31, 1602

KING, Sir H. SEYMOUR, *Hull, Central*
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum *May* 27, 1421
Exchange Compensation, India *May* 13, 361
Gambling Raid, Hull *May* 13, 381
Indian Staff Corps *May* 27, 1421
Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 20, 914
Vaccination, Royal Commission *May* 13, 361
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1681, 1682, 1696

KINLOCH, Sir J. G. S., Bart., *Perth, E.*
Argentine Cattle Trade *May* 24, 1131
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 345

KNOWLES, Mr. LEES, *Salford, W.*
Supply: £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1578
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1368, 1386; *May* 31, 1647

KNOX, Mr. E. F. VESEY, *Londonderry City*
Business of the House: Supply, Civil Service Votes *May* 20, 938
Charge of Murder, Omagh *May* 20, 921
Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 964, 965
Land Rating, Ireland *May* 20, 936
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1057
Londonderry Lunatic Asylum *May* 24, 1137, 1138

LABOUCHERE, Mr. HENRY, *Northampton*
Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 937

LABOUR QUESTIONS, ETC.
Artisans' Dwellings, London, Q. Mr. T. H. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1610
Cleaning Machinery in Motion, Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 28, 1506
Colliery Accident, Polesworth, Q. Sir B. W. Foster; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1255
Factory and Workshops Act 1895, Dock and Wharf Machinery, Q. Mr. Sydney Buxton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266
Housing of the Working Classes Act, Q. Sir B. W. Foster; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 18, 722
Labourers' Cottages
  Ireland, Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 623. *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 917

[*cont.*

LABOUR QUESTIONS, ETC.—cont.

Labourers' Cottages—cont.

Meath, *Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 114

Strabane, *Q.* Mr. A. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1623

Labourers (Ireland) Acts, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell: *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1408

Laundry Workers, *Q.* Mr. D. Lloyd-George; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 507

Lead Poisoning, *Q.* Mr. R. McKenna; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1134

Mines and Quarries, Statistics, *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 11, 197

Mining Accident, Durham, *Q.* Mr. C. Fenwick; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 7, 18

Truck Act 1896, *Qs.* Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1128

Weavers, Burnley, Discharge of, Q. Mr. P. J. Stanhope; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 500

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 10, 107. *Qs.* Mr. H. Broadhurst, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley, Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 623. *Qs.* Mr. H. Seton-Karr, Mr. J. Ellis; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 932. *Qs.* Mr. H. Seton-Karr: *As.* Sir R. Webster *May* 27, 1432 (For Debates see Title of Bill)

Workmen (Compensation Insurance) Bill, Belgium, *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 729

LAMBERT, Mr. G., *Devon, South Molton*
Agricultural Holdings Act *May* 24, 1148
Business of the House, General *May* 13, 449
Crete *May* 24, 1142, 1143
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 945
Militia Officers *May* 25, 1259
Post Office Prosecution *May* 25, 1259

Land Legislation (Ireland)
Lord Inchiquin, (*Motion*) 1241; Lord Clonbrock, 1251; *Adj.* *May* 25
On Order for Resuming Adjourned Debate; Lord Clonbrock, (*Motion for further Adj.*) 1505; Viscount Clifden, 1505; (*Motion Agreed to*, 1505) *May* 28
Lord Clonbrock, (*Personal Explanation*) 1593; Viscount Clifden, 1593 *May* 31

Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill
c. 2R., Mr. Vaughan Davies, 817; Mr. Brynmor Jones, 821, 854; Mr. Powlett Milbank (*Amendt.*) 828; Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn, 831; Mr. S. Smith, 834; Mr. Stanley Leighton, 836, 846; Mr. J. H. Roberts, 841; Colonel Lockwood, 843; Mr. D. Lloyd-George, 845, 846, 847; Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, 846; Sir W. Hart Dyke, 847; Mr. F. A. Channing, 849; Mr. W. T. Howell, 851, 854; Mr. Humphreys-Owen, 857, 862; Mr. W. Long, 861, 862; (*Division*, 866) *May* 19
2R. negatived *May* 19, 869

Land Transfer Bill
l. Amendments Rep. *May* 10, 89
Read 3ª; Amendts. made and Passed *May* 11, 189
c. Read 1° *May* 13, 360

LANSDOWNE, MARQUESS OF (Secretary of State for War)
British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 491; *May* 17, 599
Volunteers Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1114, 1115

LAURIE, General J. W., *Pembroke and Haverfordwest*
Victoria Cross: Trooper Baxter *May* 21, 1021

LAW AND JUSTICE AND POLICE

Administration of Oath, Court of Justice, *Q.* Sir B. W. Foster; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 21, 1037

Amnesty to Treason-felony Prisoners, Queen's Reign, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510

Bankruptcy Court, Ireland, *Q.* Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1034

Bonâ-fide Travellers, Ballybunion (Kerry), *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 196

Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum: Hewson (Isabella), *Q.* Sir H. S. King; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1421

Brookeborough Petty Sessions, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497

Castleblaney Petty Sessions, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1427

Charges

Larceny, Tyrone, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1422

Murder

Omagh, *Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 921

Tyrone, *Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 728

Robbery, Tyrone, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1143

Constabulary, Royal Irish (see *Royal Irish Constabulary* below)

Cork and Tralee Prisons, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498

Equity Sessions, Strabane, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 10

Evictions

Durnascallon (Derry), *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915

Littledale Estate, Wicklow, *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1613

Queen's Reign, *Q.* Mr. R. K. Causton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1262

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE AND POLICE—cont.

Gambling Raid, Hull, *Q.* Sir H. S. King; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 13, 381
Gaol, Maryborough: Prisoner Thomas Collins, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 109. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1025. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413
Grand Jury
  Accounts, Monaghan, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1147
  Kerry, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1026
  System, Ireland, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 723
High Sheriff, Carrickfergus, *Q.* Mr. R. M. Dane; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
Incorporated Law Society (Judicial Duties Expense) (see that Title)
Irish Acts, Codification, *Qs.* Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 384
Italian Ice-cream Vendors, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1028
Judge Advocate General's Department, *Qs.* Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. J. W. Mellor; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1635
Judiciary, Ireland, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Flynn, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 21, 1038
Juries Detention Bill (see that Title)
Jurors Challenged, Tyrone, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1616
Juvenile Offenders, *Q.* Mr. D. F. Goddard; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 720
Land
  Commission, Ireland, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 12. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 192. *Q.* Mr. P. A. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 509. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. C. Flynn, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 620. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 925. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1265. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Captain Donelan, Mr. J. Gilhooly; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1603
  Commissioners, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 13, 364
  Sub-Commissions, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. S. Young; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 363
Larceny, Charge of, Tyrone, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 21, 1032; *May* 25, 1269. *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 27, 1422
Letterbreen Petty Sessions, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
Magisterial Jurisdiction, Petty Sessions, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1037
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill (see that Title)
Metropolitan Police Courts Bill, *Qs.* Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *As.* Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir M. Hicks Beach, Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 7, 14
Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill (see that Title)
Metropolitan Police Offenders, Queen's Reign, *Q.* Mr. J. Lowles; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 17, 629
Military Prisons, *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. L. R. Holland; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1620
Murder, Charge of
  Omagh, *Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 921
  Tyrone, *Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 728
Newbliss Petty Sessions Courthouse, Monaghan, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
Oath, Administration of, Court of Justice, *Q.* Sir B. W. Foster; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 21, 1037
Petty Sessions
  Brookeborough, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497
  Castleblaney, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1427
  Fees, Limerick, *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
  Letterbreen, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
  Magisterial Jurisdiction, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1037
  Newbliss, Courthouse, *Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
Police
  Arrangements, Granard, *Qs.* J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 98
  Extra Allowance to, Queen's Reign, *Q.* Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1029. *Q.* Captain Norton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412
  Force, Kerry, *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. D. Kilbride; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1414
  Indian, *Q.* Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1627
  Pensioners, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1269
Police and Stolen Property Bill (see that Title)
Post Office Prosecution, *Q.* Mr. G. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1259
Powell v. *Kempton Park Company*, *Q.* Sir J. H. Kennaway; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 31, 1634
Prisons
  Cork and Tralee, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 498
  Maryborough: Prisoner Thomas Collins, *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 109. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1025. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413
  Military, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. L. R. Holland; *As.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1620

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE AND POLICE—cont.
- *Prisons*—cont.
  - *Reading, Discharge of Warder, Qs.* Mr. M. Davitt; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420
  - *System, Scotland, Qs.* Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 10, 106; *May* 24, 1127
- *Prisons Bill* (see that Title)
- *Probation of First Offenders Act, Q.* Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1033
- *Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill* (see that Title)
- *Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee* (see that Title)
- *Robbery, Charge of, Tyrone, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1143
- *Royal Irish Constabulary*
  - *Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. J. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
  - *Tullyvin (Cavan), Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 11, 195
- *Sessions*
  - *Equity, Strabane, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 10
  - *Petty*
    - *Brookeborough, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497
    - *Castleblaney, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1427
    - *Fees, Limerick, Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
    - *Letterbreen, Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 617; *May* 18, 732. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 20, 931
    - *Magisterial Jurisdiction, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1037
    - *Newbliss, Courthouse, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1135
- *Sheriff*
  - *High, Carrickfergus, Q.* Mr. R. M. Dane; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 504
  - *Westmeath, Appointment of, Q.* Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1628
- *Statute Law Revision and Consolidation Bills, Q.* Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 20, 935
- *Treason-felony Prisoners*
  - *Amnesty to, Queen's Reign, Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
  - *Cape Colony Resolution, Q.* Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 7, 15
- *Warder, Reading Prison, Discharge of, Qs.* Mr. M. Davitt; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266; *May* 27, 1420

LAWRENCE, Mr. WILLIAM F., *Liverpool, Abercrombie*
- Liverpool City Churches Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1121, 1126
- Mersey Channels Bill, 3R. *May* 10, 183
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1683

LAWSON, MR. J. GRANT (Parliamentary Charity Commissioner), *York, N.R., Thirsk and Malton*
- Berriew School Scheme *May* 31, 1622
- Charity Scheme, Thornton-in-Craven *May* 20, 927, 928
- Covent Garden Theatre Fund *May* 18, 729
- Queen's Reign, Thanksgiving Service *May* 13, 375
- Swansea Grammar School *May* 31, 1611
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 258
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1381

(Rulings as Chairman of Committee)
- *Miscellaneous—May* 14, 561; *May* 31, 1682, 1690, 1691

LEA, Sir THOMAS, Bart., *Londonderry, S.*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 300
- Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 562

LECKY, Mr. W. E. HARTPOLE, *Dublin University*
- Irish Antiquities *May* 28, 1519
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 266, 283, 304

LECONFIELD, Lord
- Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1494

LEES, Sir ELLIOTT, Bart., *Birkenhead*
- Queen's Reign, Route of Procession *May* 13, 376
- Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 243

LEGH, Hon. T. WODEHOUSE, *Lancashire, S. W., Newton*
- Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 55
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1648

LEIGHTON, Mr. STANLEY, *Shropshire, Oswestry*
- Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 836, 846

LENG, Sir JOHN, *Dundee*
- Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 342
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Day *May* 27, 1411; *May* 28, 1509

LEUTY, Mr. T. R., *Leeds, E.*
- Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 906
- Post Office Establishments *May* 20, 912
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill In Com. *May* 25, 1313

LEVEN AND MELVILLE, Earl of
- Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1493

Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill
c. Intro., Mr. A. D. Provand ; Read 1° *May* 24, 1216

LISTER, Lord
British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 583

Liverpool City Churches Bill
c. 2R., Mr. J. H. Roberts, (*Amendt.*) 1117 ; Mr. J. C. Williams, 1120 ; Mr. W. F. Lawrence, 1121 ; Mr. J. W. Mellor, 1123 ; Mr. W. Long 1124 ; (*Division*, 1125) *May* 24
Read 2° *May* 24, 1125
Mr. J. H. Roberts, (*Motion*) 1125 ; Mr. W. F. Lawrence, 1126 ; (*Division*, 1126) *May* 24

Llandudno Urban District Council Bill
c. Considered as Amended : Mr. Brodrick, (*Amendt.*) 903, 905 ; Mr. R. McKenna, 903 ; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 906 ; Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, 906 ; Mr. T. R. Leuty, 906 ; Mr. W. Jones, 906 ; Mr. Sydney Gedge, 906 ; (*Division*, 907) *May* 20
Read 3° *May* 20, 907

LLEWELYN, Sir J. T. DILLWYN, Bart., *Swansea Town*
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 831
Swansea Grammar School *May* 31, 1611

LLOYD-GEORGE Mr. DAVID, *Carnarvon Boroughs*
Committees, Ascension Day *May* 26, 1345
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 845, 846, 847
Laundry Workers *May* 14, 507
Supply : £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1573

Local Authorities (Scotland) Loans Bill
c. Withdrawn *May* 24, 1214

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment Bill
c. Intro., Mr. J. Bigwood ; Read 1° *May* 12, 312

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. H. Broadhurst ; Read 1° *May* 18, 734

Local Government Act 1894 (Parochial Charities)
Mr. E. Strachey, (*Notice of Motion*) *May* 25, 1251

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD
President—Mr. H. CHAPLIN
Secretary—Mr. T. W. RUSSELL

Boards of Guardians, Public Bills, *Q.* Sir W. H. Houldsworth ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 17, 628
Cattle Food, Imported, *Q.* Mr. C. T. Giles ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 31, 1631
County Council Accounts, *Q.* Mr. E. Strachey ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 378
Death of a Pauper, City of London, *Q.* Mr. D. Crilly ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 21, 1035
Housing of the Working Classes Act, *Q.* Sir B. W. Foster ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 18, 722
Joint Burial Committees, *Q.* Mr. J. H. Johnstone ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell *May* 14, 505
Local Government Electors, *Q.* Sir H. Fowler ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1267
Newington Vestry Election, *Q.* Mr. J. Bailey ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 27, 1419
Notification of Infectious Diseases Act, *Q.* Sir J. T. Brunner ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 377
Parish Councils Association, *Qs.* Mr. R. T. Hermon-Hodge ; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell *May* 25, 1253
Pauper, Death of, City of London, *Q.* Mr. D. Crilly ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 21, 1035
Queen's Reign, Cycle Demonstration, *Q.* Colonel Lockwood ; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 913
Rating Assessment, *Q.* Mr. H. Finch-Hatton ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 371
Uxbridge Union, *Q.* Mr. J. Bigwood ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 24, 1130
Vaccination, Lymph Supply, *Q.* Sir W. O. Priestley ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 27, 1426
Vestry Election, Newington, *Q.* Mr. J. Bailey ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 27, 1419
Water Supply
  London
    Bill, *Q.* Mr. H. S. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 17, 616
    Commission, *Qs.* Mr. H. S. Samuel, Mr. T. Lough ; [Mr. Speaker ;] *As.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 17, 615
  Urswick, *Q.* Sir B. W. Foster ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell *May* 7, 8

Local Government, Ireland : Ministerial Proposals
Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1040, 1044, 1059 ; Mr. J. Dillon, 1044, 1048, 1049, 1059 ; Mr. E. H. Carson, (*Motion for Adj.*) 1046, 1061 ; Mr. G. Balfour, 1049 ; Colonel Saunderson, 1049 ; Mr. T. M. Healy, 1050 ; Sir J. Lubbock, 1051 ; Mr. J. A. Rentoul, 1051 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1053 ; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 1054 ; Mr. J. Redmond, 1055 ; Sir R. U. Penrose FitzGerald, 1056 ; Mr. Vesey Knox, 1057 ; Sir J. Haslett, 1057 ; Mr. T. Lough, 1058 ; (*Motion withdrawn*, 1061) *May* 21
(For Questions see IRELAND)

Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill
c. Considered as Amended: Mr. J. Bryce, (*Amendt.*) 340, 347, 350, (*Instr. to Com.*) 352; Sir Donald Currie, 342, 346; Sir J. Leng, 342; Mr. C. B. Renshaw, 344; Sir C. Dalrymple, 344; Mr. J. W. Mellor, 344; Sir J. G. S. Kinloch, 345; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 346, 351, (*Amendt.*) 352; Mr. R. B. Haldane, 347; Mr. A. Cross, 348; Mr. Graham Murray, 349, 350; Mr. J. G. Weir, 350; Mr. F. A. Channing, 351; Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell, 351; (*Division* 352); (*Words Added*, 352). Main Question as Amended Agreed to, 352 *May* 13
Re-committed to Select Com. *May* 13, 352

Lockwood, Colonel A., *Essex, Epping*
East London Water Bill *May* 13, 356
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 843
Queen's Reign, Cycle Demonstration *May* 20, 913

Lockwood, Sir Frank, *York City*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1292

Locomotives on Highways Bill
c. Read 2° and com. to Standing Com. on Trade, etc. *May* 28, 1592

Logan, Mr. J. W., *Leicester, Harborough*
Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 174
Dog Muzzling *May* 20, 931
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 779; In Com. *May* 27, 1485; *May* 31, 1649, 1654

Londonderry, Marquess of
Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 453, 462, 464

LONG, Right Hon. WALTER H. (President of the Board of Agriculture), *Liverpool, West Derby*
American Cattle *May* 28, 1511, 1512
Dog Muzzling *May* 20, 931
Extraordinary Tithe Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 231
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 861, 862
Liverpool City Churches Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1124
Ordnance Survey, Mayo *May* 17, 626
Supply
  £34, 291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1586, 1590
  £132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1535
Weighing of Cattle, Scotland *May* 13, 368

Lough, Mr. Thomas, *Islington, W.*
Agricultural Rating Act, Ireland *May* 21, 1024
Alcoholic Beverages *May* 27, 1407
Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 175

[*cont.*

Lough, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Business of the House, General *May* 10, 119, 120; *May* 13, 394
Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 981, 983
Land Rating, Ireland *May* 20, 936
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1058
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 215, 216
Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 178
Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill *May* 14, 511
Post Office
  Establishment *May* 20, 911
  Overtime *May* 31, 1630
  Savings Bank *May* 31, 1604
Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1403
Supply
  £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1563, 1566
  £132,221 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1534
Water Supply, London *May* 17, 616
Whitsuntide Holidays *May* 20, 938

Lowles, Mr. J., *Shoreditch, Haggerston*
Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 444
Queen's Reign, Adverse Records *May* 17, 629, 630

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Cumberland, Penrith*
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 346, 351, 352

(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)
Appeal in Certain Civil Matters (Ireland) Bill
The Chairman said, he had considered the matter very carefully. If the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University had been confined to the cases dealt with in the Bill, it would have been in order. But it went very much beyond that, and therefore it went beyond the scope of the Bill. The title was not the only guide to what was in the Bill, but the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University went beyond the subject-matter of the Bill, and therefore it was not in order *May* 11, 236
Budget Resolutions
The Chairman said: "I must remind the hon. Member that the general financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland cannot be discussed on this Resolution. The only question now before the Committee is in regard to the imposition of the duty on tea." *May* 10, 157
The Chairman said, the hon. Member was not entitled to take a general survey of the taxation of this Country on the Resolution before the Committee. That Resolution related only to the tea duty, and the hon. Gentleman must confine himself to that question *May* 10, 159

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*

(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)—cont.

Budget Resolutions—cont.

The Chairman said: "The general custom which has been followed this year is that the general discussion is taken until a Resolution is passed. The first Resolution, the Income Tax Resolution, has been passed by the House." *May* 10, 160

Supply: £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc.

The Chairman said: "Order, order! To discuss that would be out of order. The point the hon. Member is anxious to raise should be raised in Committee of Ways and Means. There is here no question of taxation, it is only a question of granting the money." *May* 28, 1538

The Chairman said, it must be obvious to the hon. Member that they could not discuss on the Vote for Harbours and Lighthouses whether or not Ireland paid her fair share of the general taxation. The hon. Member would be perfectly entitled to discuss whether too much money under this Vote was spent on English and Scottish harbours *May* 28, 1539

The Chairman said: "I must name the hon. Member, Mr. REDMOND, for disregarding the authority of the Chair." *May* 28, 1539

[The CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Mr. SPEAKER having resumed the Chair,]

The Chairman said: "Mr. Speaker, I have to report to you that, during the discussion of a Resolution in Supply, it became my duty to call to order the hon. Member for Waterford City, and, in consequence of persistent irrelevance, I requested him to resume his seat under the Standing Orders of the House. He stated that he would decline to comply with my order, and it then became necessary for me to name the hon. Member. In consequence of that, a Motion was made that the hon. Member should be suspended from the service of the House; and I have to report to you, Sir, that that Motion was put, and was carried in Committee." *May* 28, 1540

The Chairman said: "I have already ruled more than once on that point, that that question cannot be raised upon Votes in Supply. It must be raised in Committee of Ways and Means. This is not the proper time to raise it. I hope the hon. Member will therefore not persist in continued irrelevancy." *May* 28, 1541

The Chairman said: "I have already ruled that that is not a sufficient ground, and that the matter cannot be discussed in Supply. If the hon. Member persist in discussing it in Supply I must regard his conduct as grossly disorderly, and, under these circumstances, I must request him to withdraw from the House." *May* 28, 1541

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*

(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)—cont.

Supply: £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc.—cont.

The Chairman said: "I do not know whether it is really necessary for me to repeat what I have already ruled—that that question cannot be raised in Committee of Supply. There are other and proper opportunities for raising that question. All I have ruled this afternoon is, that this is not a proper occasion for raising that question, and if the hon. Member persist in disregarding my ruling I am afraid I shall have to put the Standing Order in force." *May* 28, 1543

The Chairman said: "The hon. Member is perfectly entitled to object to this Vote on the ground that it is too large, and that too much money is spent on English and Scottish harbours and not enough on Irish harbours; but the question of the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland cannot be discussed on this Vote. I think the hon. Member will see—on reflection it will be obvious to him—that it must be so, because otherwise the same question can be raised on every Vote, and that would clearly be against the ordinary rules and practice of the House. Therefore that seems to me to be sufficient ground, amongst others, for saying that the question cannot be discussed now, and therefore I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the Vote." *May* 28, 1544

The Chairman said: "If that be so, the hon. Member will be disorderly, for he will be violating the ruling I have laid down. If the hon. Member persist in that course I shall have to put the Standing Order in force." *May* 28, 1544

The Chairman said: "The hon. Member is grossly disorderly in his last remark. My ruling is not to the effect quoted by the hon. Member. My ruling is, that the hon. Member is not entitled on the present occasion to discuss the question of the financial relations of Great Britain and Ireland. If he cannot state his objections to this Vote without discussing that question, there is no necessity for him to state them, and he can remain silent. If, however, he persist in stating them, and bringing that question in, I shall have to take some steps." *May* 28, 1545

The Chairman said: "Order, order! The hon. Member is evidently anxious to disregard the ruling I have recently given. I hope he will not force me to put the Standing Order in force. I have had to do it in the case of some of his colleagues, and I warn him that if he persist in the course he is pursuing I shall have to do so in his case." *May* 28, 1546

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*

(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)—cont.

Supply: £8,485 for House of Lords, Salaries and Expenses

The Chairman said, it would not be possible for the hon. Member to discuss the position of the House of Lords upon the question of the salaries of the House of Lords officers. To get rid of the House of Lords, legislation would be necessary; and, as the hon. Member was well aware, they could not discuss legislation on dealing with Votes in Supply *May* 7, 64

The Chairman said: "The hon. Member is justified in protesting and dividing against this Vote or any other, but I do not think discussion can take place in Supply on the over-taxation of Ireland. That is a separate matter, which would arise in Committee of Ways and Means or on other occasions, but not in Committee of Supply." *May* 7, 65

The Chairman said, he had already pointed out that, in order to get rid of the House of Lords, legislation would be required, and in accordance with a well-known rule they could not discuss what was a subject for legislation in the course of Debates in Supply *May* 7, 75

Supply: £40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland

The Chairman said, it was unusual to discuss a case pending before the Courts. Still he could not hold that it was out of order. On the other hand, as far as he had been able to discover, the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker on former occasions had always laid down that it was unusual and undesirable, in the interest of the prisoners, to discuss a case which was pending *May* 21, 1103

Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland

The Chairman said, the hon. Member could not discuss English and Scotch matters on this Vote. That was not the proper time to discuss this grievance *May* 21, 1070

The Chairman said: "The hon. Gentleman is now discussing an alleged grievance that could only be remedied by legislation, and, as I have repeatedly reminded the Committee, subjects for legislation cannot be discussed in Supply." *May* 21, 1073

The Chairman said, that the only way of meeting it suggested by the hon. Member was by a grant of money, which would require legislation, and could not, therefore, be discussed in Committee of Supply *May* 21, 1087

Supply: £3,880 for Public Record Office, etc., Ireland

The Chairman said, that this was a matter which should be dealt with on the Vote of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. They were responsible for the issue of documents *May* 21, 1105

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*

(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)—cont.

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill

The Chairman said, it had been the custom lately when one Amendment raised a principle which was also raised by several other Amendments, although the principle was not stated in exactly the same terms, to discuss the principle generally on the first Amendment, and then, if the House accepted the principle of the Amendment, to consider the actual wording of the Amendment to be inserted. That would, he thought, be a convenient practice to follow on the present occasion *May* 25, 1275

The Chairman said: "The Minister in charge of a Bill is always entitled to make a statement." *May* 26, 1347

The Chairman said: "It is a very common practice for the Minister in charge of a Bill to make a statement whenever a convenient opportunity arises." *May* 26, 1347

The Chairman said, the discussion at the present time ought not to go beyond the Amendment now before the Committee. He could not say that a discussion upon the Amendment which the hon. Member had down some 11 pages on would not be relevant. He would be in a better position to decide when they reached the Amendment *May* 26, 1350

The Chairman said, it was clearly incompetent for him to accept such an Amendment as that which the hon. Member had on the Paper, because that would be amending the common law, the Employers' Liability Act, and Lord Campbell's Act. That was out of order on this Bill *May* 26, 1354

The Chairman said, the Committee was now engaged in discussing an Amendment not before it, and he thought it would be more convenient that the two Amendments before the House should be withdrawn, and that the hon. Member for Gainsborough should then move his Amendment *May* 27, 1439

The Chairman said: "I fail to see how the remarks of the hon. Member are relevant to the Amendment. He seems to be going rather far afield from the question he wishes to put before the Committee." *May* 27, 1444

The Chairman said: "Order, order! The general position of these insurance societies does not arise at all. The only question is, whether the compensation which they propose to give is not as favourable as that given under the Bill. The general position and administration of the societies cannot be discussed here." *May* 27, 1444

The Chairman said: "I do not think it would be relevant to insert any Amendments, except in so far as they deal with the position of the workman in regard to this Bill—that is to say, whether the compensation is more or less favourable than that which he would get from the Society." *May* 27, 1444

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
(Rulings as Chairman of Committees)—cont.
Workmen (Compensation, etc.) Bill—cont.
The Chairman said, that the hon. Member, although he was addressing his remarks to his Amendment, objected to the whole of the sub-clause under consideration, and it was in order for him to ask the House to reject it *May* 27, 1446
The Chairman said, the hon. Member was taxing the patience of the Committee. The hon. Member was objecting generally to the fourth sub-section upon the ground that friendly societies might be injured by its operation. That hardly justified his reading long extracts. The hon. Member ought to state his reasons for objecting more generally, and abstain from going into such details *May* 27, 1447
The Chairman said, that he had not given any such ruling as that. He believed the hon. Member was quite competent to put his case fully before the Committee without reading long and elaborate extracts *May* 27, 1447
The Chairman said, the Amendment seemed to be an ingenious way of getting the word "tramway" in at an early stage of the clause. He thought the hon. Member had put it in the wrong place, and that it ought to come after the word "quarry." All the Amendments ought, in fact, to come after the word "quarry," as the Government, whose Bill it was, were entitled to have their proposals laid before the Committee before those of private Members *May* 31, 1640
Miscellaneous Rulings
May 7, 65, 68, 78, 79; *May* 11, 236, 237; *May* 14, 513, 526; *May* 21, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1106; *May* 25, 1328, 1341; *May* 26, 1378; *May* 27, 1464, 1469, 1470, 1471; *May* 28, 1539, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1545, 1546, 1564; *May* 31, 1704

LOWTHER, Right Hon. JAMES, *Kent, Isle of Thanet*
British South Africa Committee, Question of Privilege *May* 25, 1272
Business of the House, General *May* 13, 393
Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 954, 963, 987, 993, 995, 1010
Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 437, 438
Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 513, 515

LOYD, Mr. A. K., *Berks, Abingdon*
Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 261

LUBBOCK, Right Hon. Sir JOHN, Bart., *London University*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 125, 144
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1051

Lunacy
Asylums
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic: Hewson (Isabella), Q. Sir H. S. King; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1421
Londonderry, Qs. Mr. Vesey Knox; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1137

Lunacy Bill
l. Pres., Lord Halsbury; Read 1ª *May* 21, 1017

LUTTRELL, Mr. H. C. FOWNES, *Devonshire, Tavistock*
Commons (Regulation) Bill, Intro. *May* 11, 204
Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 225
Prison Clerks *May* 18, 718

MACALEESE, Mr. D., *Monaghan, S.*
American Cattle *May* 28, 1511
Brookeborough Petty Sessions *May* 10, 109; *May* 14, 497
Charge of Robbery, Tyrone *May* 24, 1143
Delivery of Letters, Ireland *May* 17, 629
Irish Mail Service *May* 10, 97
Land Commissioners *May* 13, 364
Littledale Estate, Wicklow *May* 31, 1613
Newbliss Petty Sessions Courthouse, Monaghan *May* 24, 1135
Petty Sessions, Magisterial Jurisdiction *May* 21, 1037
Postal Deliveries, Ireland *May* 14, 499
Publican's Licence, Ireland *May* 20, 923
Rural Postmen
Dismissal *May* 28, 1521
Ireland *May* 24, 1141
Stamp Duty, Ireland *May* 17, 625
Strabane Equity Sessions *May* 7, 10

MACARTNEY, MR. W. G. ELLISON (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Antrim, S.*
Fishery Cruisers *May* 20, 907

McCALMONT, General HUGH, *Antrim, N.*
Turco-Greek War *May* 10, 100

McDERMOTT, Mr. PATRICK, *Kilkenny, N.*
Potato Crop, Ireland *May* 14, 504

MACDONA, Mr. J. CUMMING, *Southwark, Rotherhithe*
Burial, Premature *May* 24, 1139
Queen's Reign, Royal Irish Constabulary *May* 21, 1030
Supply: £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1562

M'HUGH, Mr. P. A., *Leitrim, N.*
Land
Commission, Sligo *May* 7, 12
Sub-Commission *May* 14, 509
Supply: £3,880 for Public Record Office, Ireland *May* 21, 1106

McIVER, Sir LEWIS, Bart., *Edinburgh, W.*
  Equivalent Grant, Scotland *May* 27, 1406
  Pneumatic Messages *May* 31, 1624, 1625

McKENNA, Mr. R., *Monmouthshire, N.*
  Lead Poisoning *May* 24, 1134
  Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 903
  Post Office, Female Clerks *May* 10, 98
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 811; *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1152, 1173, In Com. 1208, 1209; *May* 25, 1294; *May* 26, 1382; *May* 27, 1468, 1470; *May* 31, 1643, 1701

MACLEAN, Mr. JAMES M., *Cardiff*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1184; *May* 25, 1293; *May* 31, 1641, 1652

MACLURE, Mr. J. W., *Lancashire, S.E., Stretford*
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1400

MACNEILL, Mr. J. G. SWIFT, *Donegal, S.*
  Army Regulations, Wearing the Shamrock *May* 10, 100, 101, 102, 103
  Cape Garrison *May* 11, 200; *May* 14, 494
  Crewe, Representation *May* 17, 634, 635
  Falkland Islands *May* 7, 16
  Gipsies *May* 18, 732
  Irish Mail Service *May* 17, 624, 625
  Loan Fund Societies, Ireland *May* 10, 107, 108
  Prime Minister, Dual Offices *May* 10, 89
  Queen's Reign, Visit of Sultan's Son *May* 13, 376; *May* 14, 495
  Royal Irish Academy *May* 10, 105, 106
  Supply
    £49,705 for Foreign Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 46
    £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 68, 74, 77
    £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 526
    £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 79, 80, 81
  Treason-felony Prisoners, Ireland *May* 7, 15

MAPLE, Sir J. BLUNDELL, *Camberwell, Dulwich*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1167

MAPPIN, Sir FREDERICK T., Bart., *York, W. R., Hallamshire*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1373

Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Bill
c. Considered as Amended *May* 20, 1015
  Read 3° and Passed *May* 25, 1344
l. Read 1ª *May* 28, 1505

Married Women (Ireland) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. M. Healy; Read 1° *May* 19, 872

MASSEY-MAINWARING, Hon. W. F. B., *Finsbury, Central*
  South Kensington Museum *May* 13, 392
  Wallace Bequest, Manchester House *May* 13, 391

MAXWELL, Sir H. E., Bart., *Wigtown*
  Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 984

MAXWELL, Sir J. M. STIRLING- (see STIRLING-MAXWELL)

MAYO, Earl of
  Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 459
  Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1234, 1240
  Land Law (Ireland) Acts *May* 20, 902
  Municipal Franchise, Ireland *May* 20, 896

MELLOR, Colonel J. J., *Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe-cum-Farnworth*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 27, 1451

MELLOR, Right Hon. JOHN WILLIAM, *York, W. R., Sowerby*
  Incorporated Law Society, Judicial Duties, Expense *May* 11, 247
  Judge Advocate General's Department *May* 31, 1635
  Liverpool City Churches Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1123
  Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 344
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1401
  Supply: £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1583
  Voluntary Schools Act *May* 13, 373

MERCHANT SHIPPING
  Ballinamore Canal, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 908. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1407
  British
    Pilots, Foreigners as, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
    Seamen
      Discharge of, Abroad, *Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1406
      Foreign Ports, in, *Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 732
  Canadian Fast Atlantic Service, *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 25, 1267
  Canals
    Ballinamore, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 908. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1407
    Ireland, *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 723
    Longford Harbour, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726

[*cont.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING—cont.

- *Canals*—cont.
  - *Lough Mask and Ballinrobe, Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 14, 494
  - *Canals and Navigable Rivers (Ireland) Bill, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 10, 106
- *Discharge of British Seamen Abroad, Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1406
- *Dock and Wharf Machinery, Factory and Workshops Act 1895, Q.* Mr. Sydney Buxton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1266
- *Fisheries*
  - *Irish, Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1413
  - *Scottish Board, Qs.* Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1608
  - *Sea, Ireland, Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 930
- *Fishery*
  - *Cruisers*
    - *Great Britain and Ireland, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Macartney *May* 20, 907
    - *Scotland, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1134; *May* 27, 1418; *May* 31, 1632
  - *Inquiry, Listowel, Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 31, 1633
- *Fishing*
  - *Ground, Plymouth, Sunken Wrecks, Qs.* Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616
  - *River Feale, Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1130
  - *Salmon, Cashen River, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
- *Foreign*
  - *Officers and Engineers, Mercantile Marine, Qs.* Mr. J. F. Flannery, Sir A. B. Forwood; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 724
  - *Ports, British Seamen in, Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 732
- *Foreigners as British Pilots, Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
- *Harbour*
  - *Balbriggan, Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 13, 388
  - *Longford Canal, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726
  - *Port Ness, Lewis, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 11, 197. *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
  - *Works, Plymouth, Q.* Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 13, 360
- *Herrings*
  - *Brand Fees, Q.* Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1606
  - *Duty on, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1136
  - *Imported, Q.* Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 17, 614
  - *Scotch, at St. Petersburg, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 13, 380
- *King's Lynn, Pilot Commissioners, Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1417

[*cont.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING—cont.

- *Lewis, Port Ness Harbour, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 11, 197. *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
- *Lighthouses*
  - *Keepers, Q.* Mr. D. N. Nicol; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 28, 1510
  - *Red Sea, Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1416
- *Lighting, Red Sea, Q.* Sir E. S. Hill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 99
- *Longford Canal Harbour, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 18, 726
- *Mercantile Marine*
  - *Accidents to Seamen, Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 731
  - *Foreign Officers and Engineers, Qs.* Mr. J. F. Flannery, Sir A. B. Forwood; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 724
- *Merchant Shipping Undermanning Bill* (see that Title)
- *Mersey Channels Bill* (see that Title)
- *Mersey Docks Bill, Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1423
- *Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill* (see that Title)
- *Piers*
  - *Ard West, Carna, Connemara, Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 99
  - *Kerry*
    - *Salleen, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1426
    - *Sneem, Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
  - *Loughshinny, Dublin, Q.* Mr. J. J. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 387
- *Pilot Commissioners, King's Lynn, Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1417
- *Pilots, Foreigners as British, Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
- *Plymouth*
  - *Fishing Ground, Sunken Wrecks, Qs.* Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616
  - *Harbour Works, Q.* Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 13, 360
- *Pollen Act, Lough Neagh, Qs.* Mr. P. C. Doogan; Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 920
- *Red Sea*
  - *Lighthouses, Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1416
  - *Lighting,* Sir E. S. Hill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 99
- *River Feale Fishing, Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Mr. J. Atkinson *May* 24, 1130
- *Salleen Pier, Kerry, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1426
- *Salmon Fishing, Cashen River, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1256
- *Scottish Fisheries Board, Qs.* Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1608
- *Sea Fisheries, Ireland, Q.* Mr. G. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 930
- *Seamen*
  - *Accidents to, Mercantile Marine, Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 731

[*cont.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING—cont.
Seamen—cont.
British
Discharge of, Abroad, Q. Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1406
Foreign Ports, in, Q. Mr. J. Havelock-Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 732
Sneem Pier, Kerry, Qs. Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1629
Start Bay, Removal of Sand, Q. Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 13, 389
Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Ground, Qs. Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616
Trawling, Moray Firth, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1256
Tuskar Light Telephonic Communications, Q. Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 93. *Q.* Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1405

Merchant Shipping (Undermanning) Bill
c. Rep. with Amendts. from Standing Com. on Trade, etc. *May* 13, 394
Considered as Amended *May* 17, 713
Read 3^{o} and Passed *May* 31, 1705

Mersey Channels Bill
c. 3R., Mr. D. Crilly, 183; Mr. W. F. Lawrence, 183 *May* 10
Read 3^{o} and Passed *May* 13, 452
l. Read 1^{a} *May* 14, 464
2R., Lord Pirbright *May* 25, 1241
Read 2^{a} and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 25, 1241
In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; and re-com. to Standing Com. *May* 28, 1504

METROPOLIS
Artisans' Dwellings, Q. Mr. T. H. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1610
British Museum, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1636
Covent Garden Theatre Fund, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 18, 729. *Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 31, 1603
Cruelty to Animals, Qs. Captain Donelan; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1410
Custom House, Q. Mr. C. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1135
Death of Pauper, Q. Mr. D. Crilly; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 21, 1035
East London Water Bill (see that Title)
House of Commons, Divisions, Q. Mr. J. W. Crombie; *A.* Sir W. Walrond *May* 18, 721
Hyde Park
Cycling in, Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 10, 94
Footpaths, Qs. Captain Norton; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 24, 1131
Italian Ice-cream Vendors, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1028
Magnetic Observatory, Greenwich, Q. Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 28, 1520
Marylebone, Excise Prosecution, Q. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 10, 111

[*cont.*

METROPOLIS—cont.
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill (see that Title)
Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill, Qs. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill; *As.* Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir M. Hicks Beach, Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 7, 14
(For Debate see Title of Bill)
Metropolitan Water Companies Bill (see that Title)
Newington Vestry Election, Q. Mr. J. Bailey; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 27, 1419
Performing Bears, Streets, Q. Colonel Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 14, 506
Postal Deliveries, Circulars, Q. Mr. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1430
Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee (see that Title)
School Board Divisions, Q. Mr. T. G. Fardell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1128
South Kensington Museum, Qs. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. A. J. Mundella, Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 392. *Qs.* Lord Warkworth, Mr. T. Skewes-Cox, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 28, 1522. *Qs.* Sir F. S. Powell, Mr. C. A. Whitmore; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1614
Wallace Bequest, Manchester House, Qs. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring, Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 391
Water Supply
Commission, Qs. Mr. H. S. Samuel, Mr. T. Lough; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 17, 615
London Bill, Q. Mr. H. S. Samuel; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 17, 616
Westminster Hall, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 14, 506
Wormwood Scrubbs, Q. Mr. W. E. T. Sharpe; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 14, 504

Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill
c. 2R., Debate Resumed: Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, (*Amendt.*) 205; Mr. C. Harrison, 207; Mr. Jesse Collings, 207, 216, 217; Mr. J. Stuart, 210; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 212; Mr. J. Caldwell, 213; Mr. E Gray, 215; Mr. T. Lough, 215, 216; Mr. Sydney Buxton, 218; Mr. Stuart-Wortley, 219; (*Division,* 220); *May* 11
Read 2^{o} and com. to Standing Com. on Law, etc. *May* 11, 221

Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill
c. 2R., Mr. T. Lough, 178; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 178; Mr. D. Crilly, 178 *May* 10
Read 2° *May* 10, 178
In Com., Rep. without Amendt. *May* 11, 232
Read 3° and Passed *May* 11, 232
l. 2R., Lord Belper *May* 14, 466
Read 2^{a} and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 14, 467
In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 17, 613
Read 3^{a} and Passed *May* 18, 717
(For Questions see METROPOLIS)

Metropolitan Water Companies Bill
- *c.* Mr. H. Chaplin, (*Application for leave to Intro.*) 1149 ; Sir J. Pease, 1150 *May* 24
- Intro., Mr. H. Chaplin ; Read 1° *May* 24, 1151

MILBANK, Mr. POWLETT C. J., *Radnor*
- Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 828

MILDMAY, Mr. F. B., *Devon, Totnes*
- Artillery Practice, Plymouth Sound *May* 27, 1419
- Plymouth Harbour Works *May* 13, 360
- Start Bay, Removal of Sand *May* 13, 389

MILWARD, Colonel VICTOR, *Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon*
- Business of the House, General *May* 28, 1523
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 944
- Queen's Reign, Illuminations *May* 18, 724
- Supply : £132.859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1574
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1191

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
- *Alcoholic Beverages*, *Qs.* Mr. T. Lough ; *As.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 27, 1407
- *Benefices Bill*, *Qs.* Viscount Cranborne ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 21, 1038
- *Burial, Premature*, *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Macdona ; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1139
- *Crewe, Representation of*, *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour ; [Mr. Speaker ;] *May* 17, 634
- *Dog Muzzling*, *Q.* Mr. J. W. Logan ; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 20, 931
- *Flax, Foreign Bounties*, *Qs.* Mr. A. Cross ; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 721
- *Gambling in Futures and Options*, *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 92
- *Herrings*
  - *Brand Fees*, *Q.* Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1306
  - *Duty on*, *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1136
  - *Imported*, *Q.* Sir C. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 17, 614
  - *Scotch, St. Petersburg*, *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 13, 380
- *Inebriates, Reformatories*, *Qs.* Dr. Farquharson ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 510
- *Lead Poisoning*, *Q.* Mr. R. McKenna ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 24, 1134
- *Local Loan Fund*, *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1023
- *Midwives Registration Act*, *Q.* Mr. W. Hazell ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 390
- *Mines and Quarries Statistics*, *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 11, 197
- *Notification of Infectious Diseases Act*, *Q.* Sir J. T. Brunner ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 377
- *Paris Fire, Safety of Public Buildings*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Aird, Mr. T. G. Fardell ; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 10, 95

[*cont.*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS—cont.
- *Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee* (see that Title)
- *Rating Assessment*, *Q.* Mr. H. Finch-Hatton ; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 371
- *Revenue, Great Britain and Ireland*, *Q.* Mr. J. Morley ; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 13, 382
- *Royal Patriotic Fund*, *Q.* Mr. A. M. Brookfield ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 511
- *Sale of Food and Drugs Act*, *Q.* Mr. A. F. Jeffreys ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 390
- *Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment Bill*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 27, 1431
- *Stationery Office*, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1510
- *Tithe Redemption Fees*, *Q.* Mr. A. F. Jeffreys ; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 31, 1634
- *Turco-Greek War*, *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 119
- *Vehicles (Lights) Bill*, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 18, 730
  (For Debate see Title of Bill)
- *War Risks*
  - *British Ships*, *Qs.* Mr. J. O'Kelly, Mr. W. Allan ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 11, 199
  - *National Insurance*, *Qs.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, Sir G. Baden-Powell ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 118

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester*
- Supply : £132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1531

MONKSWELL, Lord
- Copyright Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 31, 1594
- Volunteers Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1115

MONTEAGLE, Lord
- Municipal Franchise, Ireland *May* 20, 895

MOON, Mr. E. R. PACY, *St. Pancras, N.*
- Supply : £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 60, 61

MORGAN, Mr. J. LLOYD, *Carmarthen, W.*
- Post Office Annuities *May* 10, 104

MORLEY, EARL OF (Chairman of Committees [H.L.])
- Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 457
- Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1236
- Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 878
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 1

MORLEY, Right Hon. JOHN, *Montrose Burghs*
- Business of the House, General *May* 10, 119 ; *May* 11, 203 ; *May* 13, 393
- Greece and the Powers *May* 11, 201, 202
- Mashonaland *May* 31, 1626, 1627
- Revenue, Great Britain and Ireland *May* 13, 382
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 292
- Supply : £68, 431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 533, 534
- Turco-Greek War *May* 10, 119 ; *May* 13, 393

MORRIS, Lord
  Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 1R. *May* 13, 337
  Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill, In Com. *May* 11, 186, 187

MORRISON, Mr. W., *York, W.R., Skipton*
  Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 244

MORTON, Mr. E. J. C., *Devonport*
  Business of the House, General *May* 10, 184
  Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 58, 60, 61

MUNDELLA, Right Hon. A. J., *Sheffield, Brightside*
  Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 124
  Secondary Education *May* 24, 1133
  South Kensington Museum *May* 13, 392
  University Colleges, Grant *May* 13, 389

MUNTZ, Mr. P. A., *Warwick, Tamworth*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1173

MURDOCH, Mr. C. T., *Reading*
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1402

MURNAGHAN, Mr. G., *Tyrone, Mid*
  Charge of Murder, Tyrone *May* 18, 728
  Sea Fisheries, Ireland *May* 20, 930

MURRAY, Colonel C. WYNDHAM, *Bath*
  Army Staff Officers, India *May* 31, 1619
  Black Watch Regiment, Subathu *May* 25, 1251

MURRAY, RIGHT HON. A. GRAHAM (Lord Advocate), *Buteshire*
  Certificated Teachers *May* 24, 1142
  Civil Service Clerks *May* 31, 1606
  Congested Districts, Scotland *May* 7, 10
  Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill *May* 20, 908
  Deportation of Paupers *May* 14, 509; *May* 17, 631
  Fishing Cruiser, Scotland *May* 24, 1134; *May* 27, 1419; *May* 31, 1632
  Herring Brand Fees *May* 31, 1606
  Herrings, Imported *May* 17, 614
  Inhabited House Duty, Scotland *May* 27, 1404
  Inspectors of Poor, Scotland *May* 31, 1618
  Local Taxation Returns, Scotland *May* 13, 388
  Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 349, 350
  Parish Councillors, Scotland *May* 31, 1618
  Port Ness Harbour, Lewis *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
  Prison System, Scotland *May* 10, 107; *May* 24, 1128
  Public Works, Scotland *May* 13, 369
  St. Andrews University *May* 14, 501

MURRAY, Right Hon. A. GRAHAM—*cont.*
  Scottish Fishery Board *May* 31, 1608, 1609
  Stornoway and Carloway Road *May* 24, 1140, 1141
  Telegraph Extensions, Scotland *May* 27, 1425
  Water Supply, River Nethy *May* 10, 90; *May* 27, 1425

NAVY
  First Lord—Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN
  Secretary—Mr. W. G. E. MACARTNEY
  Civil Lord—Mr. J. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN
  Artillery Practice, Plymouth Sound, Q. Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 27, 1419
  Fishery Cruisers, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Macartney *May* 20, 907
  Her Majesty's Ships, Letters for, Q. Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 614
  Illumination of Fleet, Members of Parliament, Queen's Reign, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1508
  Letters for Her Majesty's Ships, Q. Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 614
  Naval
    Manœuvres, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1521
    Review, Queen's Reign, Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 18, 725. *Q.* Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1615
  Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment Bill (see that Title)
  Personnel, Q. Mr. E. Flower; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1613
  Plymouth
    Harbour Works, Q. Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 13, 360
    Sound, Artillery Practice, Q. Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 27, 1419
  Pulmonary Diseases, Q. Captain Phillpotts; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 7, 13
  Queen's Reign
    Members of Parliament,
      Illumination of Fleet, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1508
      Naval Review, Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 18, 725
    Naval
      Forces, Marine and, Q. Captain Phillpotts; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 7, 9
      Review
        Civil Servants, Q. Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1615
        Members of Parliament, Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 18, 725
    Royal Naval Reserve, Medal for, Q. Sir J. S. B. Simeon; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1509
  Royal
    Marines, Reserve, Q. Admiral Field; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 14, 507
    Naval Reserve,
      Medal, Queen's Reign, Q. Sir J. S. B. Simeon; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1509
      Stornoway, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1609
  Stornoway, Royal Naval Reserve, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1609

Navy and Marines (Wills) Act (1865) Amendment Bill
l. 2R., Earl of Hopetoun *May* 10, 88
  Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 10, 89
  In Com., Rep. without Amendt. and re-com. to Standing Com. *May* 13, 327
  Rep. without Amendt. *May* 18, 717
  Read 3ª and Passed *May* 20, 893

NEWDIGATE, Mr. F. A., *Warwickshire, Nuneaton*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1652

NICOL, Mr. DONALD N., *Argyllshire*
  Lighthouse Keepers *May* 28, 1510

NORTON, Captain C. W., *Newington, W.*
  Civil Service Clerks *May* 31, 1605
  Education Department
    Examiners *May* 11, 191
    Junior Examiners *May* 31, 1612
  Hyde Park, Footpaths *May* 24, 1131
  Militia Field Officers *May* 24, 1132
  Queen's Reign
    Jubilee Procession *May* 31, 1615
    Metropolitan Police *May* 27, 1412
    Veterans' Pensions *May* 27, 1413
  Supply: £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1567, 1572
  Upper Division Clerks, Charity Commission *May* 11, 190
  Westminster Hall *May* 14, 506
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1682, 1702

NORTON, Lord
  Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1229
  Secondary Education *May* 14, 453; *May* 18, 717; *May* 21, 1017

NUSSEY, Mr. T. W., *Pontefract*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1175

O'BRIEN, Mr. PATRICK, *Kilkenny City*
  Agricultural Rating Act, Ireland *May* 21, 1024
  Army Food and Forage Supplies *May* 31, 1625
  Blackrock Township Commissioners *May* 13, 386
  Eviction, Durnascallon (Derry) *May* 20, 915
  Irish Mail Service *May* 24, 1144; *May* 31, 1625
  Labourers' Cottages, Ireland *May* 20, 917, 918
  Local
    Government, Ireland *May* 31, 1635, 1636
    Loan Fund *May* 21, 1023
  Mersey Docks Bill *May* 27, 1423
  Military Prisons *May* 31, 1620, 1621
  Post Office Establishments *May* 17, 631
[*cont.*

O'BRIEN, Mr. PATRICK—*cont.*
  Queen's Reign
    Adverse Records *May* 17, 630
    Jubilee Procession *May* 25, 1262
  Rathkeale Union, Election of Guardian *May* 21, 1030
  Religious Orders, Ireland *May* 25, 1267
  Royal College of Science, Dublin *May* 21, 1022
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 306
  Science and Art Classes, Ireland *May* 21, 1036
  Technical Education, Ireland *May* 21, 1023
  Telegraph Offices
    Balcarra (Mayo) *May* 20, 919
    Public Guarantees *May* 13, 370
  Veterinary College, Dublin *May* 13, 386
  Voters' Lists, Westmeath *May* 27, 1424

O'BRIEN, Mr. P. J., *Tipperary, N.*
  Glebe Act, Ireland *May* 24, 1146; *May* 27, 1423
  Irish Mail Service *May* 24, 1145

O'CONNOR, Mr. ARTHUR, *Donegal, E.*
  Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 152, 157, 160, 169, 170, 176
  Labourer's Cottage, Strabane *May* 31, 1623

O'CONNOR, Mr. JAMES, *Wicklow, W.*
  Blackrock Township Commissioners *May* 10, 114
  Eviction, Littledale Estate, Wicklow *May* 11, 192

O'CONNOR, Mr. T. P., *Liverpool, Scotland*
  Civil Service, Second Division Clerks *May* 17, 622

O'KELLY, Mr. JAMES, *Roscommon, N.*
  War Risks, British Ships *May* 11, 199

OLDROYD, Mr. MARK, *Dewsbury*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1371

O'MALLEY, Mr. W., *Galway, Connemara*
  Ard West Pier, Carna, Connemara *May* 10, 99
  Irish Mail Service *May* 14, 496
  Postal Delivery, Carna *May* 10, 100

ONSLOW, EARL OF (Under Secretary of State for India)
  British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 486
  East India Company's Officers' Superannuation Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 313
  Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 313

Parliament.

LORDS—

Business of the House and Public Business
- *Whitsuntide Recess, Q.* Earl of Kimberley; *A.* Marquess of Salisbury *May* 31, 1602

Members
- *Personal Statement (Griffith's Valuation)*—Viscount Clifden *May* 24, 1116

Miscellaneous
- *Queen's Reign, Diamond Jubilee* (see that Title)

Sat First
- *May* 14—Lord Lilford, after the death of his father

COMMONS

Business of the House and Public Business
- *Adjournment*—Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Statement*) *May* 28, 1592
- *Business of the House, Qs.* Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. B. L. Cohen, Sir J. S. B. Simeon; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 115. *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. T. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 119. *Qs.* Sir J. T. Brunner, Mr. E. J. C. Morton, Mr. D. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 184. *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley, Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 11, 203. *Qs.* Mr. J. Morley, Mr. J. Lowther, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. T. Lough, Mr. J. G. Weir, Mr. J. P. Farrell; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 393. *Qs.* Mr. G. Lambert, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 449. Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Statement*) *May* 14, 580. *Qs.* Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. J. H. Roberts, Mr. L. Courtney, Mr. Brynmor Jones; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 632. *Q.* Mr. F. F. Begg; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 24, 1148. *Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 25, 1272. *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Williams, Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. F. A. Channing, Colonel Milward, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. J. Clancy; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 28, 1523. *Qs.* Captain Sinclair, Sir W. Harcourt; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1637
- *Indian Budget, Q.* Mr. S. Smith; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 25, 1271
- *Morning Sittings on Tuesdays*—Sir M. Hicks Beach, (*Notice of Motion*) 17; Captain Bethell, 17 *May* 7
  Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Motion*) 120; Mr. Sydney Gedge, 120; (*Motion Agreed to*, 121) *May* 10

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—Commons—cont.

Business of the House and Public Businesss—cont.
- *Private Bill Legislation*
  - *Ireland, Qs.* Mr. J. L. Carew, Mr. J. J. Clancy; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 10, 93
  - *Scotland, Qs.* Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 391
- *Supply*
  - *Civil Service Votes, Q.* Mr. Vesey Knox; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 938
  - *Colonial Office Vote, Q.* Sir W. Harcourt; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 18, 733
  - *Ordnance Factory Vote, Q.* Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 20, 924
  - *War Office Vote, Q.* Sir A. F. Acland-Hood; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 14, 512
- *Suspension of Twelve o'Clock Rule*—Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Motion*) 633, 634; Mr. J. H. Roberts, 633; Mr. L. Courtney, 633; Mr. Brynmor Jones, 634; (*Motion Agreed to*, 634) *May* 17
- *Whitsuntide Holidays*—Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Statement*) *May* 28, 1592

Committees
- *Ascension Day*—Mr. A. J. Balfour, (*Motion*) 1345; Mr. D. Lloyd-George, 1345; Mr. W. Johnston, 1345, 1346; [Mr. Speaker, 1346;] (*Division*, 1346) *May* 26
- *British South Africa, Q.* Mr. J. Lowther (*Question of Privilege*); *A.* Mr. Speaker *May* 25, 1272
- *Burial Grounds, Select*—*Nominated* *May* 20, 1016
- *Government Offices (Appropriation of Sites), 1896*—Ordered, That Report be referred to Select Com. on Government Offices (Appropriation of Sites) *May* 19, 872
- *Money Lending, Select*—Nominated *May* 10, 183
  Mr. D. Lloyd-George and Mr. A. K. Loyd added to Com. *May* 26, 1396
- *Parliamentary Election Petitions*—Appointed and Nominated *May* 14, 580
- *Statute Law Revision and Consolidation Bills, Q.* Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 20, 935

Members
- *Queen's Reign*
  - *Illumination of Fleet, Q.* Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1508
  - *Luncheon, Price of Tickets, Q.* Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *A.* Lord Stanley *May* 31, 1615
  - *Members' Approaches, Jubilee Day, Q.* Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 28, 1507
  - *Naval Review, Q.* Mr. A Cross; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 18, 725
  - *Passes for, Q.* Captain Chaloner; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 913
  - *Westminster Hall, Closing of, Q.* Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *A.* Lord Stanley *May* 31, 1616
- *Suspension of* (see under SUPPLY: *Harbours, Lighthouses, etc.*)

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—Commons—cont.
Miscellaneous
  Crewe, Representation, Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour; [Mr. Speaker] *May* 17, 634
  House of Commons
    Divisions, Q. Mr. J. W. Crombie; *A.* Sir W. Walrond *May* 18, 721
    Duration of Speeches, Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 17, 632
    Whitsuntide Holidays, Qs. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. H. Labouchere, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. T. Lough; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 937
  Journals of House—Mr. P. M. Thornton, (*Motion to correct*) 265; [Mr. Speaker, 265;] Mr. J. Daly, 265; (*Motion Agreed to*, 265) *May* 12
  Parliamentary
    Correspondence, Postage, Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 365
    Voters' Lists, Revision, Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 508
  Speeches in Parliament (see that Title)
  Westminster Hall, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 14, 506

New Writ Issued
  May 21—For the County of Hants (Eastern or Petersfield Division) *v.* William Wickham, esquire, deceased

Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration Bill
c. Intro., Mr. J. Tully; Read 1° *May* 24, 1216

Parnell, Mr. J. H., *Meath, S.*
  Local Government Board, Auditors, Ireland *May* 27, 1416

Paulton, Mr. J. M., *Durham, Bishop Auckland*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1161; In Com. *May* 26, 1387; *May* 27, 1481

Pease, Mr. Joseph A., *Northumberland, Tyneside*
  Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 163, 165
  Military Prisons *May* 31, 1620
  Slavery in Zanzibar *May* 14, 506
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1153; In Com. *May* 25, 1303; *May* 27, 1462, 1463, 1467, 1474, 1476; *May* 31, 1704
  Zanzibar *May* 28, 1516

Pease, Sir Joseph W., Bart., *Durham, Barnard Castle*
  Metropolitan Water Companies Bill, 1R. *May* 24, 1150
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1400, 1403
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1163, In Com. 1188; *May* 25, 1304, 1308; *May* 27, 1436; *May* 31, 1644, 1671

PEMBROKE and MONTGOMERY, Earl of (Lord Steward of the Household)
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 2

Pensions
  Annuities, Post Office, Q. Mr. Lloyd Morgan; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 10, 104
  Commutation Board, Q. Mr. J. Caldwell; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 10, 90
  Crimean and Indian Veterans, Queen's Reign, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 28, 1510
  Crimean Veteran: Brennan (John), Q. Mr. J. Tully; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 31, 1632
  Police Pensioners, Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1269
  Teachers (Elementary) Pension Fund, Q. Mr. D. H. Coghill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 10, 118
  Teachers' Superannuation Bill, Q. Mr. W. Younger; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 27, 1430

Perks, Mr. R. W., *Lincolnshire, Louth*
  Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 942
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1403
  Uganda Railway *May* 27, 1430
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 27, 1465, 1484; *May* 31, 1658

Phillpotts, Captain A. S., *Devonshire, Torquay*
  Navy, Pulmonary Diseases *May* 7, 13
  Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 7, 9

Pickard, Mr. B., *York, W.R., Normanton*
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1290, 1328; *May* 27, 1471, 1474

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H., *Bethnal Green, S.W.*
  Excise Prosecution, Marylebone *May* 10, 111
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 411, 412,
  Llandudno Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *May* 20, 906
  Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 205
  Metropolitan Police Courts Bill *May* 7, 14, 15
  Probation of First Offenders Act *May* 21, 1033
  Radhanpur State Property *May* 10, 110
  Volunteers Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 179, 180; *May* 11, 233, 234
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 681; *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1152; In Com. *May* 26, 1347, 1354, 1355; *May* 31, 1681

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
c. 2R., Mr. D. Crilly, 491, 492; [Mr. Speaker, 492;] Mr. J. P. Farrell, 492 *May* 14
Read 2° *May* 17, 613
Mr. D. Crilly, (*Instr. to Com.*) 613, 614; Mr. Ritchie, 614; (*Motion Agreed to*, 614) *May* 17

PINKERTON, Mr. J., *Galway Borough*
Queen's Colleges, Ireland *May* 20, 922, 923
Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1087, 1090

PIRBRIGHT, Lord
Mersey Channels Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1241

PIRIE, Captain DUNCAN V., *Aberdeen, N.*
Army Staff Appointments, India *May* 27, 1428; *May* 31, 1619, 1620
Supply
£29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund *May* 28, 1576, 1577
£189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1559

PLAYFAIR, Lord
British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 589
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1223

Plumbers Registration Bill
c. Rep. with Amendts. from Standing Com. on Trade, etc. *May* 13, 394

Police and Stolen Property Bill
c. Sir Matthew White Ridley, (*Application for leave to Intro.*) *May* 20, 940
Intro., Sir Matthew White Ridley; Read 1° *May* 20, 940

Polling Arrangements (London) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. E. Bond; Read 1° *May* 10, 184
Withdrawn *May* 24, 1215

Poor Law Bill
c. Intro., Mr. T. W. Russell; Read 1° *May* 17, 635

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act (1896) Amendment Bill
c. Read 2° *May* 13, 451
In Com. *May* 19, 871
In Com. *May* 20, 1016

Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Bill
c. Withdrawn *May* 24, 1213
(For Questions see IRELAND)

POST OFFICE
Postmaster General—Duke of NORFOLK
Adult Messengers, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1609
Annuities, Q. Mr. Lloyd-Morgan; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 10, 104
Balcarra Telegraph Office, Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 919
Canadian Mail Service, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1619
Carna Postal Delivery, Q. Mr. W. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 100
Circulars, Postal Deliveries of, Q. Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1430
Cork Postmen, Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 388
Delivery of Letters
  Ireland, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 629
  United Kingdom, Q. Mr. A. F. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 370
Dundalk Post Office, Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 929
Dungeness Telegraph Office, Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 378
Female Clerks, Q. Mr. R. McKenna; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *May* 10, 98
Glasgow Telephone Service, Q. Mr. F. F. Begg; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 928
Gratuities to Postmen, Q. Mr. H. Finch-Hatton *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 372
Guide, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1253
H.M.'s Ships, Letters for, Q. Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 614
Indian and Australian Mails, Q. Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 730
Letters
  Delivery of
    Ireland, Q. Mr. D. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 629
    United Kingdom, Q. Mr. A. F. Jeffreys; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 370
  Her Majesty's Ships, for, Q. Mr. Gibson Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 614
  Official Postmarks, Q. Mr. Henniker Heaton; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 627
Lewis
  Postal Facilities, Q. Mr. J. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 91
  Post Offices, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 189; *May* 20, 909
Mail Service
  Canadian, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1619
  India and Australia, Q. Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 730
  Irish, *Qs.* Mr. J. Daly, Mr. D. Macaleese; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 97. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 194. *Qs.* Mr. W. O'Malley, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 496. *Qs.* Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. R. M. Dane; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 624. *Qs.* Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1144. *Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1265. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1513. *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1625

[*cont.*

POST OFFICE—cont.

- *Official Postmarks on Letters, Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 627
- *Oldham Telegrams, Q.* Mr. R. Ascroft ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 727
- *Overtime, Q.* Mr. T. Lough ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1630
- *Parcel Post, Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1032
- *Parish Councils, Scotland, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 368
- *Parliamentary*
  - *Correspondence, Postage, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 365
  - *Voters' List, Revision, Q.* Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 508
- *Pneumatic Messages, Qs.* Sir L. McIver ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1624
- *Postage, Parliamentary Correspondence, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 365
- *Postal*
  - *Arrangements, Scotland, Queen's Reign, Q.* Sir J. Leng ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1411
  - *Deliveries*
    - *Carna, Q.* Mr. W. O'Malley ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 100
    - *Circulars, Q.* Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1430
    - *Ireland, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 499
  - *Facilities*
    - *Cavan, Q.* Mr. J. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1404
    - *Lewis, Q.* Mr. J. Caldwell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 91
  - *Orders, Q.* Mr. G. B. Hudson ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1515
- *Post Cards, Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 627
- *Postmen*
  - *Auxiliary, Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1508
  - *Cork, Q.* Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 388
  - *Gratuities to, Q.* Mr. H. Finch-Hatton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 372
  - *Rural, Ireland, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1141
- *Post Offices*
  - *Adult Messengers, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1609
  - *Dundalk, Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 929
  - *Establishments, Qs.* Mr. J. Stuart, Sir H. Fowler ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 7, 6. *Qs.* Sir A. K. Rollit, Mr. J. Daly, Mr. J. P. Farrell : *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 11, 199. *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 631. *Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 731. *Qs.* Mr. T. Lough, Mr. T. R. Leuty ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 911. *Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1512
  - *Guide, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1253
  - *Lewis, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 189 ; *May* 20, 909
  - *Overtime, Q.* Mr. T. Lough ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1630

[*cont.*

POST OFFICE—cont.

- *Post Office Consolidation Bill* (see that Title)
- *Prosecution, Q.* Mr. G. Lambert ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1259
- *Queen's Reign*
  - *Auxiliary Postmen, Q.* Mr. M. J. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1508
  - *Closing Telegraph Offices, Q.* Mr. H. E. Kearley ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 374
  - *Offenders, Qs.* Mr. J. Lowles, Mr. J. L. Carew, Mr. P. O'Brien ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 630
  - *Postal Arrangements, Scotland, Q.* Sir J. Leng ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1411
- *Rural*
  - *Postmen, Ireland, Q.* Mr. D. Mecaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1141
  - *Post Messenger, Dismissal, Q.* Mr. D. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1521
- *Savings Bank*
  - *Investments, Q.* Mr. T. Lough ; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 31, 1604
  - *Withdrawals by Telegraph, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 368 ; *May* 20, 923 ; *May* 25, 1252
- *Stamp Illustrations, Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 910
- *Telegrams*
  - *Non-delivery, Q.* Mr. Bryn Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 618
  - *Oldham, Q.* Mr. R. Ascroft ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 18, 727
- *Telegraph*
  - *Addresses, Q.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 370
  - *Charges, Qs.* Mr. Henniker Heaton ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 371 ; *May* 21, 1033
  - *Extensions, Scotland, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1425
  - *Offices*
    - *Balcarra (Mayo), Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 919
    - *Closing, Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. H. E. Kearley ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 374
    - *Dungeness, Q.* Sir H. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 378
    - *Number of, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1264
    - *Public Guarantee, Q.* Mr. W. T. Howell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 107. *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 370
  - *Posts, Yeovil, Q.* Mr. E. Strachey ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 379
  - *Savings Bank, Withdrawals by, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 368 ; *May* 20, 923 ; *May* 25, 1252
- *Telephone*
  - *Service, Glasgow, Q.* Mr. F. F. Begg ; *A.* Mr Hanbury *May* 20, 928
  - *System, Peterborough, Q.* Mr. R. Purvis ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 31, 1605
- *Tuskar Light, Telephonic Communication, Q.* Mr. G. Drage ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 93. *Q.* Mr. G. Drage ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1405
- *Yeovil Telegraph Posts, Q.* Mr. E. Strachey ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 379

Post Office Consolidation Bill
c. 2R., Mr. Gibson Bowles, (*Amendt.*) 221, 222, 231; [Mr. Speaker, 222;] Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 224; Mr. H. C. F. Luttrell, 225; Mr. Henniker Heaton, 225; Sir R. T. Reid, 225; Mr. W. Ambrose, 227; Sir C. Cameron, 227; Mr. M. Healy, 228; Sir R. B. Finlay, 229; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 231) *May* 11
Read 2° *May* 11, 231

Post Office Sites Bill
c. Intro., Mr. Hanbury; Read 1° *May* 13, 395

POWELL, Sir FRANCIS S., Bart., *Wigan*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 148
South Kensington Museum *May* 31, 1614
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 644; In Com. *May* 25, 1290

POWELL-WILLIAMS, Mr. J. (see WILLIAMS)

POWER, Mr. P. J., *Waterford, E.*
Supply
£18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1552, 1556
£114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1071, 1073
Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore Railway *May* 7, 11: *May* 13, 378; *May* 20, 939

Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act (1888) Amendment Bill
l. Rep. from Standing Com. with Amendts *May* 11, 185
Amendts. Rep. *May* 13, 327
Read 3ª with Amendts.; Passed, and Returned to Commons *May* 17, 612

PRETYMAN, Captain ERNEST GEORGE, *Suffolk, Woodbridge*
Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 968, 973, 974, 975, 996, 1002

PRIESTLEY, Sir W. O., *Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*
Vaccination, Lymph Supply *May* 27, 1426

Prime Minister (Dual Offices)
Mr. Swift MacNeill, (*Notice of Motion*) *May* 10, 89

Prisons Bill
c. Sir Matthew White Ridley, (*Application for leave to Intro.*) *May* 20, 939
Intro., Sir Matthew White Ridley; Read 1° *May* 20, 939

Prisons (see LAW AND JUSTICE AND POLICE)
(For Scotch and Irish Questions see under Titles SCOTLAND and IRELAND)

PROVAND, Mr. ANDREW D., *Glasgow, Blackfriars*
Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill, Intro. *May* 27, 1488
Licensing (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill, Intro. *May* 24, 1216
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 741

Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill
l. Pres., Lord Balfour, 328, 337; Lord Tweedmouth, 336; Earl of Camperdown, 337; Lord Morris, 337 *May* 13
Read 1ª *May* 13, 338
2R., Lord Tweedmouth, 873, 878; Lord Balfour, 878, 887; Earl of Morley, 878; Earl of Camperdown, 885; Lord Herschell, 892 *May* 20
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 20, 893

PURVIS, Mr. ROBERT, *Peterborough*
Telephone System, Peterborough *May* 31, 1605

Quarter Sessions Jurors (Ireland) Bill
l. In Com., Lord Morris, (*Amendt.*) 186, [*New Clause*] 187; Earl of Denbigh, 186, 187, (*Amendt.*) 188; [*Clause withdrawn,* 187]; (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 188) *May* 11
Re-committed to Standing Com. *May* 11, 189
Rep. with further Amendt. *May* 18, 717
Amendts. Rep. *May* 20, 893
Read 3ª with Amendts.; Passed, and Returned to Commons *May* 21, 1017

QUEEN'S REIGN, DIAMOND JUBILEE.
Amnesty to Treason-felony Prisoners, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. *Qs.* Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
Carriages, Regulations for, Q. Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1029
Civil Servants,
Cost of Seats, Q. Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1615
Naval Review, Q. Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1615
Crimean
Indian Veterans, and, Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 27, 1413
Veterans, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Powell-Williams *May* 28, 1510
Crown Colonies, Representatives of, Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain *May* 28, 1509
Cycle Demonstration, Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 913
Decorations, Security of, Q. Mr. R. Ascroft; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725
East End Procession, Q. Mr. Wootton Isaacson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 13, 375. *Q.* Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 31, 1616

[*cont.*

QUEEN'S REIGN, DIAMOND JUBILEE—*cont.*
Evictions, Q. Mr. R. K. Causton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1262
Foreign Consular Corps, Q. Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1127
Guardians, Powers of, Q. Mr. J. G. Holburn; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 28, 1508
High Sheriffs, Q. Sir C. Dalrymple; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 24, 1127
Illuminations, Q. Colonel Milward; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 18, 724
Income Tax, Q. Mr. J. W. Maclure; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 7, 9
Members
  Approaches for, Jubilee Day, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 28, 1507
  Illumination of Fleet, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1508
  Luncheon Tickets, Price of, Qs. Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *As.* Lord Stanley *May* 31, 1615
  Passes for, Q. Captain Chaloner; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 913
Metropolitan Police
  Adverse Records, Q. Mr. J. Lowles; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 17, 629
  Extra Allowance to, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Jesse Collings *May* 21, 1029. Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412
Naval
  Marine Forces, and, Q. Captain Phillpotts; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 7, 9
  Reserve. Medal, Q. Sir J. S. B. Simeon; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 28, 1509
  Review
    Civil Servants, Q. Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. G. J. Goschen *May* 31, 1615
    Members, Q. Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Austen Chamberlain *May* 18, 725
Officers of the Army, Q. Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 7, 9
Old Buildings, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 25, 1261
Passes for Members, Q. Captain Chaloner; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 913
Peers and Officers of House, Tickets for, Qs. Earl of Morley; *As.* Earl of Pembroke, Earl of Ancaster *May* 7, 1
Postal
  Arrangements, Scotland, Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1411
  Employees, Q. Mr. H. E. Kearley; *A.* Mr. Hanbury 13, 374
Postmen
  Adverse Records, Qs. Mr. J. Lowles, Mr. J. L. Carew, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 629
  Auxiliary, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 28, 1508
Procession, Route of, Q. Sir Elliott Lees; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 13, 376
Royal Irish Constabulary, Q. Mr. J. C. Macdona; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 21, 1030
Schools, Holiday for, Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 494. Q. Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 914
Science and Art Department, Examinations, Q. Mr. J. H. Yoxall: *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 21, 1030

[*cont.*

QUEEN'S REIGN, DIAMOND JUBILEE—*cont.*
Seats
  Civil Servants, Cost of, Q. Mr. J. P. Smith; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1615
  Indian Services, Q. Sir H. S. King; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 20, 914. Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 31, 1615
  Minor Officials of House, for, Q. Colonel Dalbiac; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 14, 495. Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 25, 1262
Stands
  Grants of Sites for, Q. Mr. E. Boulnois; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 10, 94
  Inspection of, Q. Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 10, 95
Statues, Cleaning of, Q. Mr. J. Aird; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 21, 1029
Thanksgiving Service, Qs. Mr. Grant Lawson, Sir J. T. Brunner, Mr. W. Johnston; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 375. Q. Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 25, 1263
Treason-felony Prisoners, Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin; *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 18, 725. Qs. Mr. M. J. Flavin, Mr. W. Field; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 27, 1412. Q. Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 28, 1510
Visit of Sultan's Son, Qs. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 376; *May* 14, 495
Volunteers, Review of, Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick *May* 24, 1126
Westminster Hall, Closing of, Q. Mr. G. C. T. Bartley; *A.* Lord Stanley *May* 31, 1616

QUILTER, Mr. W. C., *Suffolk, Sudbury*
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 416, 417

Railway Assessors (Scotland) Superannuation Bill
l. Read 2^a and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 14, 491
  In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; Standing Com. negatived *May* 17, 613
  Read 3^a and Passed *May* 18, 717

Railway Clearing House Bill
c. Mr. Tomlinson, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1397, 1403; Mr. F. A. Channing, 1399; Mr. J. W. Maclure, 1400; Sir J. Pease, 1400, 1403; Mr. Ritchie, 1400, 1403; Mr. J. W. Mellor, 1401; Mr. C. T. Murdoch, 1402; Mr. J. Bryce, 1402; Mr. R. W. Perks, 1403; [Mr. Speaker, 1403;] Mr. T. Lough, 1403 *Adj. May* 27

Railway Rates (Ireland)
  Mr. J. P. Farrell, (*Notice of Motion*) *May* 11, 189

RAILWAYS

Cycles, Carriage of, Q. Mr. J. Bryce ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1409
Drawings and Relics, Q. Mr. F. A. Channing ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 31, 1624
Dungarvan and Lismore, Q. Mr. P. J. Power ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 939
Great Northern Company of Ireland, Q. Mr. J. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 12
Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpur, Q. Mr. J. Dillon ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton *May* 20, 924
Ireland
  Dungarvan and Lismore, Q. Mr. P. J. Power ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 939
  Great Northern Company, Q. Mr. J. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 12
  Light Railways (see sub-head *Light Railways* below)
  Tortumna, Qs. Mr. W. Field, Mr. D. Kilbride ; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
  Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore Company, Qs. Mr. P. J. Power ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 7, 11 ; *May* 13, 378 ; *May* 20, 939
Light Railways
  Act, Qs. Earl of Camperdown ; *As.* Viscount Cross *May* 28, 1502
  Ireland, Q. Mr. M. J. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1136. *Q.* Captain Donelan ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1264
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill (see that Title)
London Tilbury and Southend Company, Q. Major Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 31, 1624
Tortumna, Qs. Mr. W. Field, Mr. D. Kilbride ; *As.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
Railway Clearing House Bill (see that Title)
Romford Station, Fatal Accident, Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 113
Uganda, Q. Mr. R. W. Perks ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 27, 1430
Waterford Dungarvan and Lismore Company. Qs. Mr. P. J. Power ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 7, 11 ; *May* 13, 378 ; *May* 20, 939

RASCH, Major F. C., *Essex, S.E.*

Cape Garrison, *May* 25, 1260
Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 20, 1009
London Tilbury and Southend Railway Company *May* 31, 1624
Queen's Reign, School Holidays *May* 14, 494
Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 238 ; *May* 17, 632
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1662

REAY, Lord

British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 491 ; *May* 17, 581
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1226

RECKITT, Mr. H. J., *Lincolnshire, Brigg*

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 812 ; *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1153

REDMOND, Mr. JOHN E., *Waterford City*
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1055
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 293. 294
Supply
  £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc. *May* 28, 1538, 1539
  £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 76

REDMOND, Mr. W. H. K., *Clare, E.*
Lighthouses, Red Sea *May* 27, 1416
Supply ; £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc. *May* 28, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545

Regular and Elders' Widows' Funds Bill
l. 2R., Earl of Onslow *May* 13, 313
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 13, 314
In Com., Rep. without Amendt. ; Standing Com. negatived *May* 14, 466
Read 3ª and Passed *May* 17, 612

REID, Sir R. T., *Dumfries District*
Post Office Consolidation Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 225
Supply : £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 29, 31, 32, 38
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1298, 1307 ; *May* 26, 1349, 1381, 1383, 1391

RENSHAW, Mr. C. B., *Renfrewshire*
Local Taxation Returns, Scotland *May* 13, 388
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 344
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1161 ; In Com. *May* 25, 1307, 1327 ; *May* 26, 1354, 1377, 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1393

RENTOUL, Mr. J. A., *Down, E.*
Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1051
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 279, 281
Supply
  £8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 70
  £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 563, 569, 572

Restraint of Evictions (London) Bill
c. Read 2° *May* 13, 452
In Com., R.P. *May* 31, 1709

RICHARDSON, Mr. THOMAS, *Hartlepool*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 773

RIDLEY, RIGHT HON. SIR MATTHEW WHITE, BART. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, N., Blackpool*

Boiler Explosions Acts *May* 17, 623
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum *May* 27, 1421

[*cont.*

Ridley, Right Hon. Sir M. W.—*cont.*
  Burial, Premature *May* 24, 1139
  Cleaning Machinery in Motion *May* 28, 1506
  Colliery Accident, Polesworth *May* 25, 1255
  Cruelty to Animals, London *May* 27, 1411
  Factory and Workshops Act 1895, Dock and Wharf Machinery *May* 25, 1266
  Gambling Raid, Hull *May* 13, 382
  Gipsies *May* 18, 732
  Juvenile Offenders *May* 18, 721
  Lead Poisoning *May* 24, 1134
  Local Government Electors *May* 25, 1267
  Metropolitan Police
    Adverse Records *May* 17, 629
    Extra Allowance to *May* 27, 1412
  Metropolitan Police Courts Bill *May* 7, 15
  Metropolitan Police Courts (Holidays) Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 178
  Mines and Quarries, Statistics *May* 11, 197
  Paris Fire, Safety of Public Buildings *May* 10, 96
  Police and Stolen Property Bill, Intro. *May* 20, 940
  Prison
    Clerks *May* 18, 719
    Reading, Discharge of Warder *May* 25, 1267; *May* 27, 1420
  Prisons Bill, Intro. *May* 20, 939
  Queen's Reign
    Adverse Records, Police *May* 17, 629
    Decorations *May* 18, 725
    Evictions in Southwark *May* 25, 1262
    Jubilee Procession *May* 10, 95; *May* 25, 1262
    Metropolitan Police, Extra Allowance to *May* 27, 1412
    Treason-felony Prisoners *May* 18, 725; *May* 27, 1412
  Reading Prison, Discharge of Warder *May* 25, 1267; *May* 27, 1420
  Truck Act 1896 *May* 24, 1129
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 10, 107; *May* 17, 624, 2R. 663, 694, 702, 703; *May* 18, 813; *May* 24, 1156, In Com. 1182, 1209, 1210; *May* 25, 1290, 1299, 1304, 1305, 1307, 1329; *May* 26, 1347, 1348, 1363, 1378; *May* 27, 1433, 1437, 1438, 1453, 1462, 1463, 1483; *May* 31, 1642, 1643, 1656, 1676, 1701, 1703, 1704
  Workmen (Compensation Insurance) Bill, Belgium *May* 18, 729

RITCHIE, Right Hon. CHARLES T. (President of the Board of Trade), *Croydon*
  Alien Immigration *May* 28, 1506
  British
    Pilots, Foreigners as *May* 25, 1257
    Seamen
      Discharge of, Abroad *May* 27, 1406
      Foreign Ports, in *May* 18, 732
  Cycles, Carriage by Rail *May* 27, 1409
  Discharge of British Seamen Abroad *May* 27, 1406
  Flax, Foreign Bounties *May* 18, 721, 722
  Foreigners as British Pilots *May* 25, 1257
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 395, 399, 401, 412, 419
  Gambling in Futures and Options *May* 10, 92; *May* 28, 1519

[*cont.*

Ritchie, Right Hon. Charles T.—*cont.*
  Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland *May* 7, 12
  King's Lynn Pilot Commissioners *May* 27, 1417
  Lighthouses
    Keepers *May* 28, 1510
    Red Sea *May* 27, 1417
  London Tilbury and Southend Railway Company *May* 31, 1624
  Longford Canal Harbour *May* 7, 4
  Mercantile Marine
    Accidents to Seamen *May* 18, 731
    Foreign Officers and Engineers *May* 18, 724
  Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill *May* 17, 614
  Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1400, 1403
  Railway Drawings and Relics *May* 31, 1624
  Red Sea
    Lighthouses *May* 27, 1417
    Lighting *May* 10, 99
  Romford Railway Station, Fatal Accident *May* 10, 113
  Seamen
    Accidents to, Mercantile Marine *May* 18, 731
    British
      Discharge of, Abroad *May* 27, 1406
      Foreign Ports, in *May* 18, 732
  Start Bay, Removal of Sand *May* 13, 389
  Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Ground *May* 17, 616, 617
  Supply
    £24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc. *May* 28, 1539
    £29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund *May* 28, 1576, 1577
    £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1562, 1568 1569, 1573
  Tuskar Light *May* 27, 1405
  Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill, Intro. *May* 27, 1432
  Wreck, *S.S. Memphis* *May* 7, 13

Roberts of Kandahar, Lord
  British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 476

Roberts, Mr. J. Bryn, *Carnarvonshire, Eifion*
  Telegram, Non-delivery *May* 17, 618
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1673

Roberts, Mr. J. Herbert, *Denbigh, W.*
  Business of the House, General *May* 17, 633
  Crete *May* 20, 931
  Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 841
  Liverpool City Churches Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1117, 1125
  Llangollen School Board *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632

Robertson, Mr. Edmund, *Dundee*
  Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 399, 418, 419, 429
  Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1361

Robertson, Mr. T. H., *Hackney, S.*
- Artisans' Dwellings, London *May* 31, 1610

Robson, Mr. W. S., *South Shields*
- Supply: £49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 18

Rollit, Sir Albert K., *Islington, S.*
- Colonial Solicitors Bill, Intro. *May* 12, 312
- Post Office Establishments *May* 11, 199
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 783; In Com. *May* 25, 1301, 1308

Royal Commissions
- *Irish Land* (see Ireland)
- *Land Law (Ireland) Acts* (see Ireland)
- *Patriotic* (see Army)
- *Vaccination* (see that Title)

Russell, General F. S., *Cheltenham*
- Cavalry Recruiting Standard *May* 27, 1417
- Military Manœuvres Bill *May* 20, 937
- Supply: £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1553, 1554, 1555

RUSSELL, Mr. T. W. (Secretary to the Local Government Board), *Tyrone, S.*
- Joint Burial Committees *May* 14, 505
- Parish Councils Association *May* 25, 1254
- Poor Law Bill, Intro. *May* 17, 635
- Water Supply, Urswick *May* 7, 8

Russell of Killowen, Lord
- Juries Detention Bill, 2R. *May* 10, 86

Rutland, Duke of
- Dublin Corporation Bill *May* 14, 462

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* 2R., Mr. W. E. H. Lecky, 266, 283, 304; Mr. J. Jordan, 272; Mr. J. Daly, (*Amendt.*) 273, 280, 281; Major Jameson, 275; Mr. J. A. Rentoul, 279, 281; Mr. T. Harrington, 283; Mr. M. Healy, 286, 294; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 289, 292; Mr. J. Morley, 292; Mr. J. Redmond, 293, 294; Sir J. Haslett, 297; Sir T. Lea, 300; Mr. S. Young, 300; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 301; Mr. W. Johnston, 303; Mr. J. Wilson (Govan), 303; Mr. J. J. Clancy 303, 304; Colonel Saunderson, 304; Mr. P. O'Brien, 306; (*Division*, 306) *May* 12
- Read 2° *May* 12, 309
- In Com., R.P. *May* 13, 452

SALISBURY, Marquess of (Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Greece and the Powers *May* 10, 85
- Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1239
- Royal Niger Company, *May* 24, 1111
- Whitsuntide Recess *May* 31, 1602

Samuel, Mr. Harry S., *Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*
- Water Supply, London *May* 17, 615, 616

Samuel, Mr. J., *Stockton-on-Tees*
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 151
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 422; *May* 17, 712
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 811; In Com. *May* 31, 1681

Saunderson, Colonel E. J., *Armagh, N.*
- Local Government, Ireland *May* 21, 1049
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 304
- Supply: £68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 530, 548, 549, 550

School Boards' Expenses Bill
- *c.* Intro., Sir J. Gorst; Read 1° *May* 17, 635

Schools
- *Attendance, Ireland, Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1415
- *Berriew School Scheme, Q.* Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1621
- *Boards*
  - *Divisions, London, Q.* Mr. T. G. Fardell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1128
  - *Llanbedr, Qs.* Lord H. Cecil; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 31, 1622
  - *Llangollen, Qs.* Mr. J. H. Roberts; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632
  - *Loans, Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
  - *North Mundham, Qs.* Mr. J. C. Williams; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 24, 1129
- *Elementary, Honiton, Holy Week, Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 498
- *Estate, Fermanagh, Q.* Mr. P. C. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 31, 1622
- *Grammar, Swansea, Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
- *Honiton*
  - *Elementary, Holy Week, Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 498
  - *National, Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
- *Industrial, Q.* Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1258
- *Irish*
  - *Epidemic, Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew, *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 24, 1134
  - *National* (see under Title Ireland)

[*cont.*

Schools—cont.

- *Jubilee Holiday for, Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 14, 494. *Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 914
- *Model*
  - *Ireland, Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 7, 3
  - *Queen's Birthday, Q.* Mr. W. Johnston; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 20, 915
- *National*
  - *Honiton, Q.* Mr. J. C. Williams; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 916
  - *Monitors, Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 27, 1405
  - *Teachers' Fund, Ireland, Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 17, 619
- *Science and Art*
  - *Classes, Ireland, Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 21, 1036
  - *Grants, Q.* Mr. J. H. Yoxall; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 13, 367
  - *Teachers, Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May* 25, 1260
- *Voluntary Schools Act, Q.* Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 7, 5. *Q.* Mr. T. G. Ashton; *A.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 10, 92. *Qs.* Mr. E. Gray, Mr. J. W. Mellor; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 13, 373. *Q.* Mr. J. W. Sidebotham; *A.* Sir R. Webster *May* 20, 935

SCOTLAND

Secretary for—Lord Balfour
Lord Advocate—Mr. A. Graham Murray
Solicitor General—Mr. C. Scott Dickson

- *Certificated Teachers, Qs.* Mr. J. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1142
- *Colonisation Board, Manitoba, Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 25, 1261
- *Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill, Q.* Mr. J. E. B. Baillie; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 7, 10. *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray, Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 20, 907. *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 31, 1636
- *Crofters' Settlements, Manitoba, Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 18, 730
- *Deportation of Paupers, Qs.* Mr. J. Daly; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 14, 509; *May* 17, 631
- *Dog Licences*
  - *Drumlithie (Kincardineshire), Q.* Mr. J. W. Crombie; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 14, 501
  - *Govan, Q.* Mr. J. Wilson (Govan); *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1026
- *Edinburgh University, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 25, 1263
- *Equivalent Grant, Q.* Sir L. McIver; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 27, 1406
- *Fishery Cruiser, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1134; *May* 27, 1418; *May* 31, 1632
- *Glasgow, Telephone Service, Q.* Mr. F. F. Begg; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 928
- *Govan, Dog Licence, Q.* Mr. J. Wilson (Govan); *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 21, 1026
- *Guardians, Powers of, Queen's Reign, Q.* Mr. J. G. Holburn; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 28, 1508

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—cont.

- *Herrings*
  - *Brand Fees, Q.* Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1606
  - *Duty on, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Curzon *May* 24, 1136
  - *Imported, Q.* Sir C. Cameron; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 17, 614
  - *Scotch, at St. Petersburg, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 13, 380
- *Inhabited House Duty, Q.* Sir T. Sutherland; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1404
- *Inspectors of Poor, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1618
- *Lewis*
  - *Designation of, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 25, 1271
  - *Port Ness Harbour, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 11, 197. *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
  - *Postal Facilities, Q.* Mr. J. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 10, 91
  - *Post Office, Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 11, 189; *May* 20, 909
- *Local Taxation Returns, Q.* Mr. C. B. Renshaw; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 388
- *Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill* (see that Title)
- *Manitoba*
  - *Colonisation Board, Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 25, 1261
  - *Crofters' Settlement, Q.* Mr. J. F. Hogan; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 18, 730
- *Moray Firth, Trawling, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1256
- *Nethy River, Water Supply, Q.* Mr. J. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 10, 90. *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1425
- *Parish*
  - *Councillors, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1618
  - *Councils, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 13, 368
- *Port Ness Harbour, Lewis, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 11, 197. *Qs.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
- *Postal Arrangements, Queen's Reign, Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1411
- *Prison System, Qs.* Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 10, 106; *May* 24, 1127
- *Private Bill Legislation, Qs.* Mr. Hedderwick; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour *May* 13, 391
- *Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill* (see that Title)
- *Public Works, Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 13, 369
- *Queen's Reign*
  - *Guardians, Powers of, Q.* Mr. J. G. Holburn; *A.* Mr. H. T. Anstruther *May* 28, 1508
  - *Postal Arrangements, Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 27, 1411
- *St. Andrews University, Q.* Mr. R. Cox; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 14, 500

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—cont.
Scottish Fisheries Board, Qs. Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 31, 1608
Stornoway and Carloway Road, Qs. Mr. J. G. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1140
Teachers, Certificated, Qs. Mr. J. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 24, 1142
Telegraph Extensions, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1425
Telephone Service, Glasgow, Q. Mr. F. F. Begg ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 20, 928
Trawling, Moray Firth, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Curzon *May* 25, 1256
Water Supply, River Nethy, Q. Mr. J. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 10, 90. *Q.* Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Graham Murray *May* 27, 1425
Weighing of Cattle, Q. Mr. J. G. Weir ; *A.* Mr. W. Long *May* 13, 367

SCOTT, Mr. C. P., *Lancashire, S.W., Leigh*
Turco-Greek War, Armistice *May* 21, 1039 ; *May* 24, 1143

SEELY, Mr. CHARLES H., *Lincoln*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1310 ; *May* 31, 1649

SETON-KARR, Mr. H., *St. Helens*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill 2R. *May* 17, 655, 703 ; *May* 20, 932, 933 ; *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1153, In Com. 1178, 1211 ; *May* 25, 1319, 1325 ; *May* 26, 1366, 1380 ; *May* 27, 1432, 1461, 1482, 1484 ; *May* 31, 1645

SHARPE, Mr. W. E. T., *Kensington, N.*
Wormwood Scrubbs *May* 14, 504

SHAW, Mr. THOMAS, *Hawick Burghs*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1358

SHEEHY, Mr. D., *Galway, S.*
Supply
£68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 561
£114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1083

Shipwrecks
S.S. Memphis, Q. Sir G. Baden-Powell ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 13
Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Ground, Qs. Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles ; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616

SIDEBOTHAM, Mr. J. W., *Cheshire, Hyde*
Voluntary Schools Act *May* 20, 935

SIMEON, Sir J. S. BARRINGTON, Bart., *Southampton*
Business of the House, General *May* 10, 117
Queen's Reign, Royal Naval Reserve *May* 28, 1509
Supply : £132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom *May* 28, 1528

SINCLAIR, Captain JOHN, *Forfarshire*
Business of the House, General *May* 31, 1637
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 27, 1463

SINCLAIR, Mr. LOUIS, *Essex, Romford*
Romford Railway Station, Fatal Accident *May* 10, 113

SKEWES-COX, Mr. T., *Surrey, Kingston*
Gipsies *May* 18, 732
South Kensington Museum *May* 28, 1522

SMITH, Mr. J. PARKER, *Lanarkshire, Partick*
Jhalawar *May* 27, 1428
Queen's Reign
Jubilee Procession *May* 31, 1615
Naval Review *May* 31 1615
Supply : £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1583
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1312 ; *May* 26, 1357, 1358 ; *May* 27, 1472, 1478, 1479

SMITH, Mr. SAMUEL, *Flintshire*
Indian Budget *May* 25, 1271
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R. *May* 19, 834

SOUTHWELL, Lord Bishop of *(Dr. George Ridding)*
British Troops in India, Health *May* 17, 597

SOUTTAR, Mr. R., *Dumfriesshire*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1661

Mr. Speaker.

THE RIGHT HON.
WILLIAM COURT GULLY, Q.C.,
Carlisle

Question of Privilege
The Resolution of 1688, to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred, is no doubt still part of the practice and Rules of the House. I need not refer more particularly to the Resolution, as the right hon. Gentleman has read its terms. All I can say as to the course to be taken by a Committee is, that when any case arises to which that Rule is applicable it is obvious that the proper course is to report to the House *May* 25, 1273

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, Mr.—cont.

Questions

The hon. Member for North Louth is entirely out of order in making suggestions of that kind. The hon. Member was stopped because he was arguing upon an answer. The hon. Member for West Belfast, as I understand, is strictly confining himself so far to the Question upon the Paper, and is stating that that Question has not been answered *May* 14, 494

I am not aware there is any precedent, at least in modern times, for making an order on an individual Member to attend the House, except for the purpose either of giving evidence before a Committee, or attending upon a Committee, or obeying a previous order of the House or Committee, or to answer for some alleged breach of privilege or order. I say nothing about the power of the House to make such an order; but I would point out that it would be a very inconvenient course to make Motions with regard to individual Members, because it might lead to retaliatory Motions from other parts of the House *May* 17, 634

Rules and Order of Debate

The Instruction to the Committee of which the noble Lord the Member for Rochester has given notice, to enable the Education Department to check the increase of the sum expended per scholar for maintenance under any School Board receiving a contribution under the Bill, is out of order, because its object may be obtained by an Amendment. The other Instruction standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Glamorganshire, providing for the payment of arrears under Section 97 of the Act of 1870, is also out of order, because its object is to increase the grant which was voted in Committee, and it would be quite out of order as an Instruction.

[While Mr. SPEAKER was delivering the above Ruling, several Members passed down the floor of the House amid cries of "Order!" Sir HENRY FOWLER: "I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is not one of the Standing Orders of the House that when you rise in the Chair every Member should remain seated?" Mr. SPEAKER replied:]

That is the Rule, and it is important in the interests of the order and decency of the proceedings of the House that it should be observed *May* 10, 122

It is out of order to refer to the Debate, and the hon. Member is not only referring to it, but is replying to a speech by the Lord Chancellor *May* 11, 222

The numbers being equal, it is my duty to vote, and in accordance with the usual practice of the Chair in such circumstances, I shall give my vote in such a way as will afford the House another opportunity of taking a decision on this matter. I therefore give my vote with the Ayes, and declare that the Ayes have it *May* 11, 262

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, Mr.—cont.

Rules and Order of Debate—cont.

As the Tellers are agreed that there was a mistake, if the hon. Member will from his place move that the Journals of the House be corrected accordingly, I have no doubt that the House will agree to the Motion *May* 12, 265

I must remind the hon. Member, as I have reminded another hon. Member, that the question is not the employment of criminals in English prisons, but the importation of goods made in prisons abroad *May* 13, 417

I cannot see how an examination of the scheme of a particular company can be entered upon on the Second Reading of this Bill *May* 17, 680

I do not see how that arises on this Bill. Of course, the hon. Member is entitled to argue that the present schemes of railway companies are schemes which would or would not be allowed by the Registrar of Friendly Societies, but that is really the only point which arises in regard to contracting out *May* 17, 680

The Money Committee (there is no question of the Committee of Ways and Means) for authorising the grant of Money for the expenses involved in the Bill must be taken before the third section of the second schedule is reached. That is the charging part of the Bill. All that the first clause of the Bill says is that compensation is to be settled by arbitration "in accordance with the second schedule to this Act." That does not fix what the terms of the second schedule are to be. Those are to be settled after the first clause has been passed, and when the second schedule is reached. There is nothing in the first clause to say that terms of the second schedule shall be the identical terms in which it stands. The House may alter it, or even strike out the power to refer to any one of the County Court Judges, and the consequent charges; but no charge can be dealt with by the Committee under that third clause of the second schedule until a Resolution in a Money Committee has been passed *May* 24, 1151

There are several Instructions on the Paper with reference to the First Order of the Day, Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill. These I will now deal with. The first Instruction, standing in the name of the hon. Member for Carmarthen Boroughs, and the two which stand in the name of the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan, propose to deal with the relations of lessors and lessees of mines. That subject, I think, is outside the scope of the Bill, which relates wholly to the relations of employers and employed, nor does the fact that the lessee happens to be the employer of a workman in a mine affect the point. The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Bethnal

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, Mr.—cont.
Rules and Order of Debate—cont.
Green, and also that of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Tyneside)—the one proposing a scheme of insurance under State supervision, and the other a scheme for State insurance—are both out of order as being outside the scope of the Bill and involving a charge on the revenue. Then there is the Instruction of the hon. Member for North Monmouth, which seeks to insert clauses with a view to amend the law of employers' liability in respect of those trades or industries to which the Bill does not apply. At present the Bill only applies to certain trades, and it will be competent to hon. Members to propose to add other trades, but it will not be competent by Instruction or otherwise to deal by way of Amendment with the law relating to trades which are excluded from the Bill, both as it stands at present and as it ultimately may stand. The Instruction standing in the name of the hon. Member for Berwickshire proposes to empower the Committee to insert provisions to secure compensation to workmen for injuries to health arising out of, and in the course of, their employment. If the Bill were not expressly limited on the face of it to injuries arising from accidents I should have said that that matter might have been dealt with by way of Amendment without an Instruction; but, having regard to the express terms of the Bill, I am of opinion that the Instruction is necessary and it is in order. The Amendment of the hon. Member for York proposes to introduce provisions to abolish the doctrine of common employment as affecting the right to compensation. As regards any trades that are included in, or may be added to, the list in the Bill, of course that might be done by Amendment, and no Instruction is necessary; as regards other trades, the Instruction would not be in order, as the law affecting them is outside the scope of the Bill. The Amendment of the hon. Member for St. Helens, dealing with the case of employers who may be financially unable to pay compensation, is out of order, because the matter can be dealt with by way of Amendment. The Amendment of the hon. Member for the Brigg Division is out of order. It proposes to insert clauses to provide for the compensation of workmen where the employer is a foreign shipowner without assets in this country. Seamen are not at present included in the Bill; if it be intended to include them, such inclusion can only cover the case of seamen employed in the United Kingdom or on British ships. For that no Instruction would be necessary. If it be intended to cover the case of seamen employed by foreign shipowners on foreign ships, that would be outside the scope of an Instruction, if not altogether outside the powers of Parliament. That disposes of all the Instructions except that of the hon. Member for Berwickshire *May* 24, 1153

[Rulings *re* Suspension of Mr. John Redmond *May* 28, 1540]

Miscellaneous Rulings
May 10, 102, 103; *May* 11, 222, 257; *May* 14, 492, 493, 494; *May* 17, 616, 680; *May* 18, 724; *May* 21, 1026; *May* 24, 1130, 1151; *May* 26, 1346; *May* 27, 1403, 1412, 1415

Speeches in Parliament
Major Rasch, (*Motion*) 238; Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, 241; Sir J. Fergusson, 242; Sir Elliott Lees, 243; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 243; Mr. R. G. Webster, 244; Mr. W. Morrison, 244; (*Division*, 245) *May* 11

Spencer, Earl
Land Valuation, Ireland *May* 13, 340

Spicer, Mr. A., *Monmouth Boroughs*
Elementary Education Act, Age Clause *May* 17, 631
Supply: £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 81, 82

Stanhope, Earl
Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1489, 1501

Stanhope, Hon. P. J., *Burnley*
Charity Scheme, Thornton-in-Craven *May* 20, 927
Discharge of Weavers, Burnley *May* 14, 500
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1287

STANLEY, Lord (Lord Commissioner of the Treasury), *Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton*
Queen's Reign, Jubilee Day *May* 31, 1616

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Finance Acts, Works of Art *May* 28, 1498

Stanmore, Lord
Royal Niger Company *May* 24, 1109

Stevenson, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, Eye*
Crete *May* 17, 626
Murder of Yusaf Yunan *May* 31, 1617

Stewart, Sir Mark J., Bart., *Kirkcudbrightshire*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1668

[cont.

STIRLING-MAXWELL, Sir J. M., Bart., *Glasgow, College*
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 351

STRACHEY, Mr. EDWARD, *Somerset, S.*
County Council, Accounts *May* 13, 378
Local Government Act 1894, Parochial Charities *May* 25, 1251
Telegraph Posts, Yeovil *May* 13, 379
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1464

STRAUSS, Mr. A., *Cornwall, Camborne*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 670

STUART, Mr. JAMES, *Shoreditch, Hoxton*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 130, 147
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 210
Post Office Establishments *May* 7, 6, 7

STUART-WORTLEY, Right Hon. C. B. (see WORTLEY)

SULLIVAN, Mr. DONAL, *Westmeath, S.*
Voters' List, Westmeath *May* 25, 1270

SUPPLY

£8 for Bankruptcy Department, Board of Trade
In Com., Vote Agreed to *May* 28, 1577. Report *May* 31, 1706

£34,291 for Board of Agriculture, Salaries and Expenses
In Com., Mr. F. A. Channing, 1577, 1590; Mr. Lees Knowles, 1578; Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, 1578; Mr. J. W. Mellor, 1583; Mr. J. P. Smith, 1583; Mr. D. Kilbride, 1584; Sir C. Dilke, 1585; Mr. G. Whiteley, 1586; Mr. W. Long, 1586, 1590. Vote Agreed to, 1590 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1706

£1,243 for Charitable Donations and Bequests Office (Ireland)
In Com., Vote Agreed to *May* 21, 1105. Report *May* 24, 1212

£49,705 for Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses
In Com., Mr. W. S. Robson, (*Amendt.*) 18; Mr. J. Ellis, 24, 25, 26; Mr. Curzon, 25, 31, 33, 38, 46, 53; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 26, 61; Captain Bethell, 28, 29, 32; Mr. J. Dillon, 29; Sir R. T. Reid, 29, 31, 32, 38; Mr. Swift MacNeill, 46; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 47, 53; Mr. T. W. Legh, 55; Mr. E. J. C. Morton, 58, 60, 61; Mr. E. R. P. Moon, 60, 61; Sir C. Dilke, 62; Sir M. Hicks Beach, 63; (*Division*, 63); (*Motion withdrawn*, 63) *May* 7

[*cont.*

SUPPLY—cont.

£18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead
In Com., Mr. J. Dillon, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1557; General Russell, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1553, 1554, 1555; Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1550, 1552, 1556; Sir H. Fowler, 1551; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1552; Mr. P. J. Power, 1552, 1556; Mr. J. G. Weir, 1555, (*Amendt.*) 1556, 1557; Mr. Humphreys-Owen, 1555; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1557); Dr. G. B. Clark, 1557; (*Division*, 1557). Vote Agreed to, 1557 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1706

£24,037 for Harbours, Lighthouses, etc.
In Com., Mr. J. J. Clancy, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1541, 1542; [Chairman, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545, 1546;] Mr. J. Redmond, 1538, 1539; Mr. Ritchie, (*Motion for Suspension of hon. Member for Waterford*) 1539; (*Divisions*, 1540); [Mr. Speaker, 1540;] Mr. W. Redmond, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545; Mr. W. Field, 1546. Vote Agreed to, 1546 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1705

£19,576 for House of Commons Offices, Salaries and Expenses
In Com., Vote Agreed to *May* 28, 1561. Report *May* 31, 1706

£8,485 for House of Lords Offices, Salaries and Expenses
In Com., Mr. J. J. Clancy, 63, 64, 65; [Chairman, 64, 65, 68, 75;] Mr. Gibson Bowles, 66, 73, 74, 77; Mr. J. Dillon, 67, (*Amendt.*) 68, 74; Mr. Swift MacNeill, 68, 74, 77; Mr. J. A. Rentoul, 70; Mr. Hanbury, 71, 74, 77; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 73; Mr. J. Daly, 75; Mr. J. Redmond, 76; (*Divisions*, 78). Vote Agreed to, 78 *May* 7. Report *May* 10, 178

£68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses
In Com., Mr. J. Lowther, 513, 515; Mr. T. M. Healy, 513, 514, 515, 523, 524, 530, 531, 533, 540, 550, 551, 553, 557; [Chairman, 513, 526, 561;] Mr. E. H. Carson, 517, 523, 524, 531, 534, 548; Mr. Swift MacNeill, 526; Mr. G. Balfour, 528, 530, 531, 533, 544, 547, 557, 562; Colonel Saunderson, 530, 548, 549, 550; Mr. J. Dillon, 533, 541, 544, 547, 548, 562, 577; Mr. J. Morley, 533, 534; Colonel Waring, 534; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 537, 540, 553; Mr. M. Healy, 549, 562, 569; Mr. J. C. Flynn, (*Amendt.*) 558; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 561; Mr. D. Sheehy, 561; Sir T. Lea, 562; (*Division*, 563); Mr. J. A. Rentoul, 563, 569, 572; Mr. D. Kilbride, 571, 572; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 575, 577; Mr. J. Daly, 578, 579; Mr. H. V. Duncombe, 579; R.P. *May* 14

SUPPLY—cont.

£40,229 for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions (Ireland)

In Com., Mr. J. Dillon, 1103, 1104; Mr. J. Atkinson, 1103; [Chairman, 1103;] Mr. G. Balfour, 1103; Mr. J. C. Flynn, 1104; Mr. R. M. Dane, 1104, 1105; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1105; (*Motion withdrawn*, 1105) *May* 21

£114,389 for Local Government Board (Ireland), Salaries and Expenses

In Com., Mr. T. M. Healy, 1061; Captain Donelan, 1061; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1062; Mr. J. Daly, 1067, 1071, 1080; [Chairman, 1070, 1073, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087;] Sir J. Colomb, 1071; Mr. P. J. Power, 1071, 1073; Mr. J. Tully, 1074, 1077, 1081; Mr. G. Balfour, 1077, 1078, 1080, 1081, 1083, 1086, 1091, 1099, 1101; Mr. Serjeant Hemphill, 1082, 1083; Mr. D. Sheehy, 1083; Mr. M. J. Flavin, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087; Mr. J. Pinkerton, 1087, 1090; Dr. R. Ambrose, 1089; Mr. D. Kilbride, 1090, 1091; Colonel Waring, 1094; Mr. J. Dillon, 1095; Mr. D. Crilly, 1101, 1102; Dr. Tanner, 1102. Vote Agreed to, 1102 *May* 21. Report *May* 24, 1212

£29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund (Grant in Aid)

In Com., Mr. J. G. Weir, 1575; Captain Bethell, 1576; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1576, 1577; Captain Pirie, (*Amendt.*) 1576, 1577; Mr. Ritchie, 1576, 1577; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1577). Vote Agreed to, 1577 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1706

£7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses

In Com., Mr. J. J. Clancy, 78, 79; [Chairman, 78, 79;] Mr. Gibson Bowles, (*Amendt.*) 79, 80; Mr. Swift MacNeill, 79, 80, (*Amendt.*) 81; Mr. Hanbury, 80, 82, 83; Mr. W. Hazell, 80, 81; (*Division*, 81); Mr. A. Spicer, 81, 82; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 82; Mr. T. Bayley, 82; Mr. T. C. T. Warner, 83; (*Divisions*, 83). Vote Agreed to, 83 *May* 7. Report *May* 10, 178

£132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses

In Com., Sir C. Dilke, 1561; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1562; Mr. J. C. Macdona, 1562; Mr. Ritchie, 1562, 1568, 1569, 1573; Mr. T. Lough, 1563, 1566; Mr. J. G. Weir, 1563, 1564, (*Amendt.*) 1573; [Chairman, 1564;] Mr. J. Burns, 1564, 1575; Mr. M. Austin, 1565; Mr. J. Dillon, 1566, 1569, 1572; Captain Norton, 1567, 1572; Mr. D. Lloyd-George, 1573; Colonel Milward, 1574; Colonel Denny, 1574; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1575). Vote Agreed to, 1575 *May* 28

[*cont.*

SUPPLY—cont.

£3,880 for Public Record Office (Ireland)

In Com., Mr. J. C. Flynn, 1105, 1107; [Chairman, 1105, 1106;] Dr. Tanner, 1106; Mr. P. A. M'Hugh, 1106; Mr. G. Balfour, 1107; Mr. D. Kilbride, 1107; R.P. *May* 21

£189,367 for Rates on Government Property

In Com., Lord H. Cecil, 1557, 1561; Mr. J. C. Flynn, 1557; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1558; Mr. B. L. Cohen, 1558; Captain Pirie, 1559; Mr. J. G. Weir, 1559; Mr. Hanbury, 1559; Dr. Clark, 1561. Vote Agreed to, 1561 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1706

£132,291 for Survey of the United Kingdom

In Com., Mr. J. Dillon, 1525, 1531, 1532, 1533; Mr. Hanbury, 1525, 1530, 1531, 1533; Sir J. S. B. Simeon, 1528; Mr. J. J. Clancy, 1529, 1530, 1537; Mr. C. J. Monk, 1531; Mr. T. Lough, 1534; Mr. W. Long, 1535. Vote Agreed to, 1537 *May* 28. Report *May* 31, 1705

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill

c. Intro., Mr. M. Healy; Read 1° *May* 14, 512
Read 2° *May* 18, 816
In Com., R.P. *May* 19, 872

SUTHERLAND, Sir THOMAS, *Greenock*
Inhabited House Duty, Scotland *May* 27, 1404
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1695

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 142

TANNER, Dr. C. K. D., *Cork, Mid*
Supply
£114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1102
£3,880 for Public Record Office, Ireland *May* 21, 1106

TEMPLETOWN, Viscount
Land Law (Ireland) Acts *May* 20, 896

TENNANT, Mr. H. J., *Berwickshire*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 734; *May* 24, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1153, 1155, 1160; In Com. *May* 26, 1353

THOMAS, Mr. ABEL, *Carmarthenshire, E.*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1161; In Com. *May* 25, 1340; *May* 31, 1705

THOMAS, Mr. D. A., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Mines and Quarries, Statistics *May* 11, 197

THORNTON, Mr. PERCY M., *Clapham*
Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 256, 257; *May* 12, 265

THRING, Lord
Copyright Amendment Bill, 2R. *May* 31, 1599

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Railway Clearing House Bill *May* 27, 1397, 1403
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1175, 1207; *May* 25, 1285, 1325; *May* 26, 1391; *May* 27, 1461, 1468

TRADE, BOARD OF

President—Mr. C. T. RITCHIE
Secretary—Earl of DUDLEY

Alien Immigration, *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 28, 1505
Argentine Cattle Trade, *Q.* Sir J. Kinloch; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1131
British
  Pilots, Foreigners as, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
  Seamen
    Discharge of, Abroad, *Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1406
    Foreign Ports, in, *Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 732
Custom House, London, *Q.* Mr. C. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 24, 1135
Cycles, Carriage by Rail, *Q.* Mr. J. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1409
Discharge of British Seamen Abroad, *Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1406
Fishing Ground, Plymouth, Sunken Wrecks, *Qs.* Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616
Flax, Foreign Bounties, *Qs.* Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 721
Foreigners as British Pilots, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill (see that Title)
Gambling in Futures and Options, *Q.* Mr. J. L. Carew; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 92. *Q.* Mr. W. Field; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 28, 1519
Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland, *Q.* Mr. J. Daly; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 12
King's Lynn, Pilot Commissioners, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1417
Lighthouses
  Keepers, *Q.* Mr. D. N. Nicol; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 28, 1510
  Red Sea, *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1416
London Tilbury and Southend Railway Company, *Q.* Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 31, 1624
Longford Canal Harbour, *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 4

[*cont.*

TRADE, BOARD OF—cont.
Mercantile Marine
  Accidents to Seamen, *Q.* Mr. J. Havelock Wilson; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 731
  Foreign Officers and Engineers, *Qs.* Mr. J. F. Flannery, Sir A. B. Forwood; [Mr. Speaker;] *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 18, 724
Pilot Commissioners, King's Lynn, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1417
Pilots, Foreigners as British, *Q.* Mr. J. A. Willox; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 25, 1257
Railway Drawings and Relics, *Q.* Mr. F. A. Channing; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 31, 1624
Red Sea
  Lighthouses, *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1416
  Lighting, *Q.* Sir E. S. Hill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 99
Romford Railway Station, Fatal Accident, *Q.* Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 10, 113
Start Bay, Removal of Sand, *Q.* Mr. F. B. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 13, 389
Sunken Wrecks, Plymouth Fishing Grounds, *Qs.* Mr. C. Harrison, Mr. Gibson Bowles; *As.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 17, 616
Tuskar Light, *Q.* Mr. G. Drage; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 27, 1405
Wreck, S.S. Memphis, *Q.* Sir G. Baden-Powell; *A.* Mr. Ritchie *May* 7, 13

Trade of the United Kingdom and the Colonies
Sir H. Vincent, (*Notice of Motion*) *May* 11, 189

Trusts (Scotland) Bill
l. In Com., Rep. without Amendt.; re-com. to Standing Com. *May* 7, 1
Rep. without Amendt. *May* 11, 185
Read 3ª and Passed *May* 13, 328

TULLY, Mr. JASPER, *Leitrim, S.*
Crimean Veteran: Brennan (John) *May* 31, 1632
Drainage Works, Ireland *May* 27, 1431
Franchise Acts, 1885 *May* 25, 1261
Granard Union *May* 31, 1628
Loan Fund Board, Ireland *May* 28, 1518
Mohill Burial Ground, Leitrim *May* 20, 928
Mullingar Union *May* 21, 1031; *May* 27, 1424; *May* 28, 1518
Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Registration Bill, Intro. *May* 24, 1216
Shorthorn Bulls, Ireland *May* 24, 1146
Supply: £114,389 for Local Government Board, Ireland *May* 21, 1074, 1077, 1081
Westmeath, Appointment of Sheriff *May* 31, 1628

TWEEDMOUTH, Lord
Provisional Order (Scotland) Bill, 1R. *May* 13, 336; 2R. *May* 20, 873, 878

URE, Mr. ALEXANDER, *Linlithgow*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1356, 1384, 1385

Vaccination
Lymph Supply, *Q.* Sir W. O. Priestley; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 27, 1426
Royal Commission, *Q.* Sir H. S. King; *A.* Mr. H. Chaplin *May* 13, 361

Vehicles (Lights) Bill
c. 2R., Mr. P. M. Thornton, 256, 257; [Mr. Speaker, 257, 262;] Mr. A. F. Jeffreys, 257; Mr. Grant Lawson, 158; Mr. F. Cawley, 258; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 258; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 259; Mr. R. Ascroft, 259; Mr. H. J. Wilson, 260; Mr. F. G. Banbury, 260; Mr. W. O. Clough, 260; Mr. A. K. Loyd, 261; Mr. J. Daly, 261; Mr. R. G. Webster, 262; Mr. J. Brigg, 262; (*Division*, 262) *May* 11
Read 2° *May* 11, 263
Mr. P. M. Thornton, (*Motion to correct Journals of House*) 265; [Mr. Speaker, 265;] Mr. J. Daly, 265; (*Motion Agreed to*, 265) *May* 12
In Com., R.P. *May* 18, 815
(For Questions see IRELAND)

Verminous Persons Bill
c. In Com. and Rep. *May* 28, 1591
Considered as Amended *May* 31, 1712

VINCENT, Colonel Sir C. E. HOWARD, *Sheffield, Central*
Alien Immigration *May* 28, 1505
Army Horses *May* 13, 365
Budget Resolutions *May* 10, 173
Cycling in Hyde Park *May* 10, 94
Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 407, 415, 436, 439
Queen's Reign, Review of Volunteers *May* 24, 1126
Telegraph Office, Dungeness *May* 13, 378
Trade, United Kingdom and Colonies *May* 11, 189

Volunteers Bill
c. In Com., Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, (*Amendt.*) 179, 180; Sir R. Webster, 180 *May* 10
In Com., Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, (*Amendt.*) 233, 234, [*New Clause*] 234; Sir R. Webster, 233, 234; (*Division*, 234); [*Clause ordered to stand part of Bill*, 234] *May* 11
Rep. as Amended *May* 11, 234
Considered as Amended *May* 12, 312
3R., Mr. J. Daly, 1012; Mr. Brodrick, 1012; Mr. H. E. Kearley, 1012; (*Division*, 1013) *May* 20
Read 3° and Passed *May* 20, 1013
l. Read 1ª *May* 21, 1017
2R., Marquess of Lansdowne, 1114, 1115; Lord Monkswell, 1115 *May* 24
Read 2ª and com. to Com. of Whole House *May* 24, 1116

WALES
Berriew School Scheme, *Q.* Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1621
Land Tenure (Wales and Monmouthshire) Bill (see that Title)

[*cont.*

WALES—cont.
Llanbedr School Board, *Qs.* Lord H. Cecil; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 31, 1622
Llandudno Urban District Council Bill (see that Title)
Llangollen School Board, *Qs.* Mr. J. H. Roberts; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632
School Boards
Llanbedr, *Qs.* Lord H. Cecil; *As.* Sir J. Gorst, *May* 31, 1622
Llangollen, *Qs.* Mr. J. H. Roberts; *As.* Sir J. Gorst *May* 20, 920; *May* 31, 1632
Swansea Grammar School, *Q.* Sir J. T. D. Llewelyn; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson *May* 31, 1611
Telegram, Non-delivery, *Q.* Mr. Bryn Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hanbury *May* 17, 618

WALROND, SIR WILLIAM H., BART. (Patronage Secretary to the Treasury), *Devon, Tiverton*
Divisions, House of Commons, *May* 18, 721

WALTON, Mr. J. LAWSON, *Leeds, S.*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1209; *May* 25, 1304, 1333; *May* 26, 1377, 1378, 1382; *May* 31, 1691

WARING, Colonel THOMAS, *Down, N.*
Supply
£68,431 for Irish Land Commission, Salaries and Expenses *May* 14, 534
£114,389 for Local Government Board (Ireland) *May* 21, 1094

WARKWORTH, Lord, *Kensington, S.*
South Kensington Museum *May* 28, 1522

WARNER, Mr. T. COURTENAY T., *Staffordshire, Lichfield*
East London Water Bill *May* 13, 358
Supply: £7,074 for Privy Council Office, Salaries and Expenses *May* 7, 83
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1652

WAR OFFICE
Secretary of State—Marquess of LANSDOWNE
Under Secretary of State—Mr. BRODRICK
Financial Secretary—Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS
(See ARMY)

WARR, Mr. AUGUSTUS F., *Liverpool, East Toxteth*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 24, 1186; *May* 31, 1697

WAYS AND MEANS
In Com., Resolved:
  That it is expedient to Amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue *May* 21, 1107
Reso. Rep. and Agreed to *May* 24, 1214
Finance Bill, *Q.* Mr. J. Dillon; *A.* Sir M. Hicks Beach *May* 31, 1631
  (For Debate see Title of Bill)

Financial Statement, 1897-98
The Budget
Sir M. Hicks Beach, (*Motion for Duty on Tea*) 152, 164, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 177; Mr. A. O'Connor, (*Amendt.*) 152, 157, 160, 169, 170, 176; [Chairman, 157, 159, 160;] Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 161; Mr. J. A. Pease, 163, 165; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 165; Mr. H. E. Kearley, 165; Mr. J. Dillon, 166; Mr. Sydney Buxton, 171, 172; Sir H. Vincent, 173; Mr. J. W. Logan, 174; Mr. T. Lough, 175; (*Division*, 177). Reso. Agreed to *May* 10
Reso. Rep. and Agreed to *May* 11, 204

WEBSTER, Mr. R. G., *St. Pancras, W.*
Speeches in Parliament *May* 11, 244
Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 262

WEBSTER, SIR RICHARD E. (Attorney General), *Isle of Wight*
Administration of Oath, Court of Justice *May* 21, 1038
Covent Garden Theatre Fund *May* 31, 1603
Powell *v.* Kempton Park Company *May* 31, 1634
Statute Law Revision and Consolidation Bills *May* 20, 935
Voluntary Schools Act *May* 20, 935
Volunteers Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 180; *May* 11, 233, 234
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 18, 756, 762, 766; In Com. *May* 24, 1209, 1210; *May* 25, 1286, 1287, 1294, 1298, 1322, 1325, 1337, 1340; *May* 26, 1350, 1353, 1355, 1357, 1367, 1377, 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1382; *May* 27, 1432, 1435, 1438, 1441, 1442, 1464, 1465, 1466, 1467, 1468, 1469, 1471, 1472, 1477, 1480; *May* 31, 1682, 1702, 1705

WEDDERBURN, Sir W., Bart., *Banffshire*
Ancient Monuments, India *May* 13, 383
Board of Revenue, Madras *May* 31, 1606
Compensation Allowance, European and Indian Officials *May* 20, 934
Exchange Compensation, India *May* 13, 361
Herring Brand Fees *May* 31, 1606
Indian Police *May* 31, 1627
Salt Duty, India *May* 13, 384
Scottish Fisheries Board *May* 31, 1608

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill
c. Intro., Mr. Ritchie; Read 1° *May* 27, 1432

WEIR, Mr. J. G., *Ross and Cromarty*
Business of the House, General *May* 13, 394
Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill *May* 20, 907, 908; *May* 31, 1636
Duty on Herrings *May* 24, 1136
Edinburgh University *May* 25, 1263
Fishery Cruisers *May* 20, 907; *May* 24, 1134; *May* 27, 1418; *May* 31, 1632
Herrings
  Duty on *May* 24, 1136
  Scotch, St. Petersburg 13, 380
Inspectors of Poor, Scotland *May* 31, 1618
Lewis
  Designation of the Island *May* 25, 1271
  Port Ness Harbour, *May* 11, 197; *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
  Post Offices *May* 11, 189, 190; *May* 20, 909
Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie Railway Bill *May* 13, 350
Parish Councils, Scotland *May* 13, 368; *May* 31, 1618
Port Ness Harbour, Lewis *May* 11, 197; *May* 13, 369; *May* 20, 934; *May* 24, 1141; *May* 27, 1418
Postal Telegraph Office *May* 25, 1264
Post Office
  Adult Messengers *May* 31, 1609
  Guide *May* 25, 1253
  Lewis *May* 11, 189, 190; *May* 20, 909
  Savings Bank *May* 13, 368; *May* 20, 923; *May* 25, 1252
Public Works, Scotland *May* 13, 369
River Nethy, Inverness-shire *May* 27, 1425
Royal Naval Reserve, Stornoway *May* 31, 1609
Scotch Herrings, St. Petersburg 13, 380
Scottish Fisheries Board *May* 31, 1608
Stornoway and Carloway Road *May* 24, 1140
Supply
  £18,000 for Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead *May* 28, 1555, 1556, 1557
  £29,215 for Mercantile Marine Fund *May* 28, 1575
  £132,859 for Privy Council Office for Trade, Salaries and Expenses *May* 28, 1563, 1564, 1573
  £189,367 for Rates on Government Property *May* 28, 1559
Telegraph Extensions, Scotland *May* 27, 1425
Trawling, Moray Firth *May* 25, 1256
Weighing of Cattle, Scotland *May* 13, 367
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1675

WEMYSS AND MARCH, Earl of
Industries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 25, 1239

Westminster (see METROPOLIS)

WHITELEY, Mr. G., *Stockport*
Supply: £34,291 for Board of Agriculture *May* 28, 1586
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1356; *May* 27, 1438, 1449, 1482

WHITMORE, Mr. C. A., *Chelsea*
South Kensington Museum *May* 31, 1614

WHITTAKER, Mr. T. P., *Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*
- Foreign Prison-made Goods Bill, 2R. *May* 13, 404, 432, 433

WILLIAMS, Mr. J. CARVELL, *Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*
- Business of the House, General *May* 28, 1523
- Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 143; 3R. *May* 20, 952
- Honiton
  - Elementary School, Holy Week *May* 14, 498
  - National Schools *May* 20, 916
- Liverpool City Churches Bill, 2R. *May* 24, 1120
- North Mundham School Board *May* 24, 1129
- Queen's Reign, Jubilee Procession *May* 21, 1029
- School Boards, Loans *May* 20, 916

WILLIAMS, MR. J. POWELL (Financial Secretary to the War Office), *Birmingham, S.*
- Army
  - Food and Forage Supplies *May* 31, 1625, 1626
  - Regulations, St. Patrick's Day *May* 28, 1521
  - Remounts *May* 25, 1270
  - Service Record: Deniston (Joseph) *May* 27, 1408
- Business of the House, Supply: Ordnance Factory Vote *May* 20, 924
- Cavalry Recruiting Standard *May* 27, 1417
- Crimean Veteran: Brennan (John) *May* 31, 1632
- Queen's Reign, Veterans' Pensions *May* 27, 1413; *May* 28, 1510
- Royal Horse Artillery *May* 31, 1607

WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY, Lord, *Lincolnshire, Horncastle*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 31, 1670

WILLOX, Mr. J. A., *Liverpool, Everton*
- Foreigners as British Pilots *May* 25, 1257
- King's Lynn, Pilot Commissioners *May* 27, 1417

WILSON, Mr. C. H., *Hull, W.*
- Custom House, London *May* 24, 1135

WILSON, Mr. H. J., *Yorkshire, W. R., Holmfirth*
- Vehicles (Lights) Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 260

WILSON, Mr. JOHN, *Durham, Mid*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1163; In Com. *May* 25, 1286, 1309, 1314, 1324; *May* 26, 1366, 1381, 1390; *May* 27, 1440, 1452, 1471, 1472

WILSON, Mr. JOHN, *Falkirk Burghs*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 686, 690; In Com. *May* 25, 1300, 1305, 1313; *May* 26, 1349, 1354, 1383, 1393; *May* 27, 1438, 1465

WILSON, Mr. JOHN, *Lanarkshire, Govan*
- Dog Licence, Govan *May* 21, 1026
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill 2R. *May* 12, 303

WILSON, Mr. JOSEPH HAVELOCK, *Middlesbrough*
- British Seamen in Foreign Ports *May* 18, 732
- Indian and Australian Mails *May* 18, 730
- Mercantile Marine, Accidents to Seamen *May* 18, 731
- Post Office Establishments *May* 18, 731
- Seamen
  - Accidents to, Mercantile Marine *May* 18, 731
  - British, in Foreign Ports *May* 18, 732
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 17, 624; In Com. *May* 25, 1312, 1318; *May* 31, 1684, 1689, 1690, 1699, 1701

WILSON, Mr. JOHN WILLIAM, *Worcestershire, N.*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 25, 1304

WOLFF, Mr. G. W., *Belfast, W.*
- American Cattle *May* 28, 1511
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, In Com. *May* 26, 1366; *May* 27, 1473

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES OF THE CROWN
- *Cycling in Hyde Park, Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 10, 94
- *Government Offices, Sites, Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 14, 495
- *Hyde Park*
  - *Cycling in, Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 10, 94
  - *Footpaths, Qs.* Captain Norton; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 24, 1131
- *Magnetic Observatory, Greenwich, Q.* Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 28, 1520
- *South Kensington Museum, Q.* Sir F. S. Powell, Mr. C. A. Whitmore; *As.* Mr. Akers-Douglas *May* 31, 1614

WOODS, Mr. SAMUEL, *Essex, Walthamstow*
- Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 653; In Com. *May* 24, 1184; *May* 25, 1309; *May* 27, 1448, 1472; *May* 31, 1676

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill

c. 2R., Mr. G. Drage, (*Amendt.*) 636; Sir F. S. Powell, 644; Mr. E. Bainbridge, 644, 703; Mr. S. Woods, 653; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 655, 703; Sir C. Dilke, 658, 663; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 663, 694, 702, 703; Sir E. S. Hill, 665; Mr. H. Broadhurst, 667; Mr. A. Strauss, 670; Mr. Atherley-Jones, 673; Mr. A. Helder, 676; Mr. R. Ascroft, 676, 680, 681; Sir W. Houldsworth, 680; Mr. J. Burns, 680; [Mr. Speaker, 680;] Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, 681; Mr. J. Wilson (Falkirk), 686, 690; Mr. A. Birrell, 690; Sir J. Joicey, 702; Mr. T. Burt, 704; Mr. C. A. Cripps, 708; *Adj.* *May* 17.

Debate Resumed on Mr. Drage's Amendt.: Mr. H. J. Tennant, 734; Mr. L. R. Holland, 737; Mr. A. D. Provand, 741; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 747, 762; Sir R. Webster, 756, 762, 766; Sir J. T. Brunner, 763, 766; Mr. E. A. Goulding, 766; Sir J. Joicey, 767, 793, 794, 805; Mr. T. Richardson, 773; Mr. C. Fenwick, 775; Sir A. Hickman, 777; Mr. J. W. Logan, 779; Sir A. K. Rollit, 783; Mr. T. G. Ashton, 786; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 789, 793, 794, 795, 805, 811; Mr. H. E. Kearley, 793; Mr. E. Bainbridge, 793; Mr. H. Broadhurst, 794, 795; Mr. J. Samuel, 811; Mr. R. McKenna, 811; Colonel Blundell, 812; Mr. H. J. Reckitt, 812; Mr. G. Drage, 813; (*Amendt. withwithdrawn*, 813) *May* 18

Read 2° *May* 18, 813

Mr. H. H. Asquith, 813; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 813 *May* 18

On the Order to go into Com.: Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1151, 1172; [Mr. Speaker, 1151, 1153]. Instructions to Com., Ten in number, stood in the following names:—Sir J. Jenkins, Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, Mr. R. McKenna, Mr. S. T. Evans (2), Mr. H. J. Tennant, Mr. J. G. Butcher, Mr. H. Seton-Karr, Mr. H. J. Reckitt, and Mr. J. A. Pease. [Mr. Speaker ruled all the Instructions out of Order except that standing in the name of Mr. H. J. Tennant;] Mr. H. J. Tennant, (*Instr. to Com.*) 1155, 1160; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1156; Mr. R. B. Haldane, 1158; Colonel Blundell, 1159; Mr. J. Burns, 1159, 1171; Mr. Stuart-Wortley, 1160; Sir J. Joicey, 1160; Mr. Abel Thomas, 1161; Mr. C. B. Renshaw, 1161; Mr. J. M. Paulton, 1161; Sir E. S. Hill, 1162; Sir C. Dilke, 1162; Sir A. B. Forwood, (*Amendt.*) 1162, 1172; Mr. G. Wyndham, 1163; Mr. J. Wilson (Durham), 1163; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 1163; Sir J. Pease, 1163; Mr. A. Cross, 1164; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1164, 1167, 1170; Sir J. Blundell Maple, 1167; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1168, 1170, 1171; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1172); Mr. H. E. Kearley, 1172; Mr. P. A. Muntz, 1173; Mr. R. McKenna, 1173; Colonel Denny, 1173; (*Division*, 1174) *May* 24

In Com., Mr. Tomlinson, 1175, 1207; Mr. T. W. Nussey, (*Amendt.*) 1175; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 1178, (*Amendt.*) 1211; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1182, 1209, 1210; Mr. H. Broadhurst, 1183; Mr. Stuart-Wortley, 1183; Mr. S. Woods, 1184; Mr. J. M. Maclean, 1184; Mr. A. F. Warr, 1186; Mr. W. J. Galloway, 1186; Sir J. Pease, 1188; Sir A. B. Forwood, 1189, 1193; Mr. F. Cawley, 1189; Colonel Milward, 1191; Mr. J. Burns, 1192, 1193, 1202; Mr. G. C. T. Bartley, 1195; Sir F. H. Evans, 1196, 1197, 1201, 1203, 1204; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1211; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1199; Mr. R. B. Haldane, 1205; Sir J. Joicey, 1206; Mr. R. McKenna, 1208, (*Amendt.*) 1208, 1209; (*Division*, 1208); Sir R. Webster, 1209, 1210; (*Amendt. negatived*, 1209); Mr. W. J. Galloway, (*Amendt.*) 1209; (*Amendt. negatived*, 1209); Mr. J. L. Walton, (*Amendt.*) 1209; (*Amendt. Agreed to*, 1210); Colonel Denny, (*Amendt.*) 1210; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1210); R.P. *May* 24

In Com., Debate Resumed on Mr. Seton-Karr's Amendt.: Sir C. Dilke, 1274, 1275, 1277, (*Amendt.*) 1296, 1300; [Chairman, 1275, 1328, 1341;] Mr. C. A. Cripps, 1277; Sir J. Joicey, 1279, 1303, 1307; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1281, 1297, 1305, 1308, 1309, 1313, 1316, 1327, 1331, 1341; Mr. C. Fenwick, 1284, 1318; Mr. Tomlinson, 1285, 1325; Mr. W. Abraham (Rhondda), 1285; Sir R. Webster, 1286, (*Amendt.*) 1287, 1294, 1298, 1322, 1325, 1337, 1340; Mr. J. Wilson (Durham), 1286, 1309, (*Amendt.*) 1314, 1324; Mr. P. J. Stanhope, 1287; Sir A. B. Forwood, 1289; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1289, 1299, 1305, 1309, 1341, 1342; Sir F. S. Powell, 1290; Mr. B. Pickard, 1290, 1328; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1290, 1299, 1304, 1305, 1307, 1329; Sir F. Lockwood, 1292; Mr. J. M. Maclean, 1293; Mr. R. McKenna, 1294; Mr. A. Hopkinson, 1295; Sir R. T. Reid, 1298, 1307; Mr. R. Ascroft, 1299; (*Amendts. withdrawn*, 1300); Mr. J. Wilson (Falkirk), (*Amendt.*) 1300, 1305, 1313; Sir A. K. Rollit, 1301, 1308; Mr. C. Harrison, 1302, (*Amendt.*) 1305; Colonel Denny, 1303, 1306, 1314; Mr. J. A. Pease, 1303; Mr. J. W. Wilson, 1304; Sir J. Pease, 1304, 1308; Mr. J. L. Walton, 1304, 1333; (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1305); Mr. R. B. Haldane, 1306, (*Amendt.*) 1329, 1342; Mr. C. B. Renshaw, 1307, (*Amendt.*) 1327; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1307; Mr. S. Woods, 1309; Mr. C. Seely, 1310; Mr. J. W. Crombie, 1311; Mr. W. J. Galloway, 1311, 1325; Mr. E. Bainbridge, 1312, 1326; Mr. J. P. Smith, 1312; Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, 1312, 1318; Mr. T. R. Leuty, 1313; (*Amendts. withdrawn*, 1314, 1318); Mr. L. Hardy, (*Amendt.*) 1318, 1327; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 1319, 1325; Colonel Blundell, 1324; Sir A. Hickman, 1325; (*Amendt. negatived*, 1327); (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1327); Mr. W. R. Bousfield, (*Amendt.*) 1327, 1328, 1340; (*Amendt. negatived*, 1329); Mr. T. T. Bucknill, 1335; Mr. Atherley-Jones, 1335, 1341; Mr S. T. Evans, 1339, 1342; Mr. Abel Thomas, 1340; R.P. *May* 25

In Com., Debate Resumed on Mr. Haldane' Amendt.: Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1347

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill—cont.

(*Amendt.*) 1348, 1363, 1378; Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, 1347, 1354, 1355; [Chairman, 1347, 1350, 1354, 1378]; Sir R. T. Reid, 1349, 1381, 1383, 1391; Mr. C. A. Cripps, 1349, 1357, 1383; Mr. J. Wilson (Falkirk), 1349, 1354, (*Amendt.*) 1383, 1393; Sir R. Webster, 1350, 1353, 1355, 1357, 1367, 1377, 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1382; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1351, 1363, 1382, 1386, 1389; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1352, 1358, (*Amendt.*) 1363, 1370, 1379, 1380, 1387, 1389, 1390, 1392, (*Amendt.*) 1393; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 1353; Sir J. Joicey, 1353, 1391; Mr. C. B. Renshaw, 1354, 1377, (*Amendt.*) 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1393; Sir A. Hickman, 1355; Mr. A. Ure, 1356, 1384, 1385; Mr. G. Whiteley, 1356; Mr. J. P. Smith, 1357, 1358; Mr. T. Shaw, 1358; Sir E. Clarke, 1359, 1369; Mr. Gibson Bowles, 1361, 1393; Mr. E. Robertson, 1361; Mr. Sydney Gedge, 1362; (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 1363); Mr. J. Burns, 1365; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 1366, 1380; Mr. J. Wilson (Durham), 1366, 1381, 1390; Mr. G. W. Wolff, 1366; Mr. C. Fenwick, 1367; Mr. Lees Knowles, 1368, 1386; Mr. R. B. Haldane, 1368; Mr. T. Burt, 1370; Mr. M. Oldroyd, 1371; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1372; Sir F. T. Mappin, 1373; (*Division,* 1374); Mr. J. L. Walton, 1377, 1378, 1382; Mr. J. B. Balfour, 1380; Mr. A. Hopkinson, 1380; Mr. Grant Lawson, 1381; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1382); Mr. R. McKenna, (*Amendt.*) 1382; (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 1383); Mr. W. J. Galloway, 1385; Mr. J. M. Paulton, 1387; Mr. Tomlinson, 1391; Mr. R. Ascroft, 1392; Colonel Denny, 1392; R.P. *May* 26

In Com., Sir Matthew White Ridley, (*Motion for Expenses*) 1433; Sir C. Dilke, 1433 *May* 27

Reso. Agreed to *May* 27, 1433

Debate Resumed on Mr. J. Chamberlain's Amendt. to Mr. J. Wilson's (Falkirk) Amendt.: Mr. W. J. Galloway, 1435, 1447, 1466, 1467, 1468; Sir R. Webster, 1435, 1438, 1441, 1442, 1464, 1465, (*Amendt.*) 1466, 1467, 1468, 1469, (*Amendt.*) 1471, 1472, 1477, 1480; Sir J. Pease, 1436; Mr. R. B. Haldane, 1436, 1469; Mr. E. Bainbridge, 1437, 1442, Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1437, 1438. 1453, 1462, 1463, (*Amendt.*) 1483; Mr. G. Whiteley, 1438, 1449, 1482; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1438, 1454, 1458, 1480; Mr. J. Wilson (Falkirk), 1438, (*Amendt.*) 1465; Mr. J. B. Balfour, 1438, 1466; Mr. Atherley-Jones, 1439, 1470; Mr. T. Burt, 1439; [Chairman, 1439, 1444, 1446, 1447, 1464, 1469, 1470, 1471;] Sir J. Joicey, 1439, (*Amendt.*) 1483, 1485; Mr. J. Wilson (Durham), 1440, 1452, 1471, 1472; Mr. H. Broadhurst, 1441, 1445; Mr. J. Burns, 1441, 1442, 1449, 1472; Mr. C. Fenwick, 1442, 1460, 1471; (*Amendts. withdrawn,* 1442); Mr. R. Ascroft, (*Amendt.*) 1442, 1443, 1444, (*Amendt.*) 1462, 1467; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1443, 1445, 1446, 1458, 1471, 1472, 1474, 1476, 1477, 1479, 1484, 1485; Mr. E. Strachey, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1464; Mr. S. Woods, 1448, 1472; Colonel Mellor, 1451; Mr. Tomlinson, 1461, 1468; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 1461, 1482, 1484; (*Division,* 1462); (*Amendt. as Amended Agreed to,* 1462); Mr. J. A. Pease, (*Amendt.*) 1462, 1463, 1467, (*Amendt.*) 1474, 1476; Mr. A. H. D. Acland, 1463; Captain Sinclair, 1463; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1463); Colonel Denny, (*Amendt.*) 1464, 1480; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1464); Sir C. Dilke, (*Amendt.*) 1464, 1465, 1471, 1482; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1465); Mr. R. W. Perks, (*Amendt.*) 1465, 1484; (*Division,* 1465;) Mr. T. H. Cochrane, 1466; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1466); (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 1466); Mr. R. McKenna, (*Amendt.*) 1468, 1470; Mr. C. A. Cripps, 1470, 1479; (*Division,* 1470); (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 1471); Mr. B. Pickard, (*Amendt.*) 1471, 1474; Mr. J. P. Smith, 1472, 1478, 1479; Mr. T. T. Bucknill, 1472; Mr. G. W. Wolff, 1473; (*Division,* 1474); (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1476); Mr. L. R. Holland, 1476, (*Amendt.*) 1477; Mr. W. R. Bousfield, 1480; Mr. Stuart-Wortley, 1481; Mr. J. M. Paulton, 1481; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1483); (*Amendt. Agreed to,* 1483); Mr. J. W. Logan, 1485; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1485) *May* 27

[*cont.*

Reso. Rep. and Agreed to *May* 28, 1591

In Com., Debate Resumed: Mr. R. Ascroft, 1639; Mr. C. Harrison, 1640, 1682, (*Amendt.*) 1701; [Chairman, 1640, 1682, 1690, 1691, 1704;] Mr. J. M. Maclean, (*Amendt.*) 1641, 1652; Sir Matthew White Ridley, 1642, 1643, 1656, 1676, 1701, 1703, 1704; Mr. R. McKenna, 1643, 1701; Sir J. Pease, 1644, 1671; Mr. H. Seton-Karr, 1645; Mr. E. Bainbridge, 1646; Mr. Lees Knowles, 1647; Mr. T. W. Legh, 1648; Captain Bethell, 1648; Mr. J. W. Logan, 1649, 1654; Colonel Blundell, 1649; Mr. C. H. Seely, 1649; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1650, 1664, 1677; Mr. T. C. T. Warner, 1652; Mr. F. A. Newdigate, 1652; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1653); Mr. E. A. Goulding, (*Amendt.*) 1653; Mr. R. W. Perks, 1658; Mr. A. F. Jeffreys, 1659; Mr. R. Souttar, 1661; Major Rasch, 1662; Mr. H. H. Asquith, 1662; Sir C. Dilke, 1666, 1691, (*Amendt.*) 1701; Sir M. Stewart, 1668; Mr. J. W. Crombie, 1669; Lord Willoughby de Eresby, 1670; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 1672; Mr. Bryn Roberts, 1673; Mr. H. S. Foster, 1673; Sir W. Hart Dyke, 1674; Mr. H. Broadhurst, 1674, (*Amendt.*) 1702, 1703; Mr. C. T. Giles, 1675; Mr. J. G. Weir, 1675; (*Division,* 1676); Mr. S. Woods, (*Amendt.*) 1676; (*Amendt. withdrawn,* 1676); Sir F. H. Evans, (*Amendt.*) 1676, 1690, 1696; Sir A. B. Forwood, 1678; Mr. Sydney Buxton, 1679, 1694; Sir E. S. Hill, 1680; Mr. J. Samuel, 1681; Sir H. S. King, 1681, (*Amendt. to Amendt.*) 1682, 1696; Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, 1681; Sir R. Webster, 1682, 1702, 1705; Mr. J. Burns, 1682, 1700; Captain Norton, 1682, 1702 Mr. W. F. Lawrence, 1683; Mr. J Havelock Wilson, 1684, 1689, 1690, 1699, 1701; Colonel Denny, 1689, 1690; Mr. J. L. Walton, 1691; Sir Donald Currie, 1694; Sir T. Sutherland, 1695; (*Amendt. to Amendt. withdrawn,* 1696); Mr. A. F.

[*cont.*

Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill—cont.
- Warr, 1697; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1698, 1700, 1701; Sir J. Colomb, 1699; (*Division*, 1701); (*Amendt. negatived*, 1701); (*Division*, 1702); (*Amendt. withdrawn*, 1704); Mr. J. A. Pease, (*Amendt.*) 1704; Mr. Abel Thomas, 1705; R.P. *May* 31

(For Questions see LABOUR QUESTIONS)

WORKS, FIRST COMMISSIONER
Mr. A. AKERS-DOUGLAS

WORTLEY, Right Hon. C. B. STUART-, *Sheffield, Hallam*
British Troops in India, Health *May* 14, 502
Metropolitan and Other Police Courts Bill, 2R. *May* 11, 219
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1160, In Com. 1183; *May* 27, 1481

Wrecks (see SHIPWRECKS)

WYNDHAM, Mr. GEORGE, *Dover*
Workmen (Compensation for Accidents) Bill *May* 24, 1163

YORK, Lord Archbishop of (*Dr. William Dalrymple Maclagan*)
Church Patronage Transfers Bill, 2R. *May* 14, 465, 466

YOUNG, Mr. S., *Cavan, E.*
Land Sub-Commissions *May* 13, 364
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May* 12, 300

YOUNGER, Mr. W., *Lincolnshire, Stamford*
Teachers (Superannuation) Bill *May* 27, 1430

YOXALL, Mr. J. H., *Nottingham, W.*
Elementary Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, In Com. *May* 10, 123, 145
Expulsion of Mr. Macpherson from Paris *May* 11, 193
Queen's Reign
  School
    Attendances *May* 20, 914
    Examinations *May* 21, 1030
Science and Art Schools, Grants *May* 13, 367
Technical Education *May* 14, 502

Zanzibar: Slavery in (see AFRICA)

END OF VOLUME XLIX., AND FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1897.

PRINTED BY WATERLOW AND SONS LIMITED, LONDON WALL, LONDON.